

# THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

---

Vol. XIX.

July, 1922

No. 3

---

## IMMORTALITY IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

BY BENJAMIN WISNER BACON.

### I. THE SYNOPTIC VIEWPOINT.

For the modern Occidental, more or less directly affected in his conceptions of the life to come by philosophic argument largely derived from Plato and the Greek thinkers, it is difficult to appreciate sympathetically the Jewish conceptions which underlie the teaching of our Synoptic Gospels. Yet these must be understood if we would obtain the real meaning of the evangelists.

It comes to us with something of a shock of surprise to read the following passage in the leading Church writer of the second century: "If you have fallen in with some who are called Christians, but who do not admit this (he has been speaking of the millennial reign), and venture to blaspheme the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; who say there is no resurrection of the dead, *and that their souls when they die are taken to heaven*; do not imagine that they are really Christians. . . . I, and others who are orthodox Christians on all points, are assured that there will be a resurrection from the dead, and a thousand years in Jerusalem, which will then be rebuilt, adorned, and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel and Isaiah and others declare."<sup>1</sup> Justin Martyr, who writes this about

---

<sup>1</sup>Dial, with Trypho, lxxx.

150 A. D., could tolerate Jewish-Christians who held that Christ was "man born of men," so long as they did not insist on Gentile believers observing the Mosaic ordinances to which they clung themselves. But he refused the very name of Christian to those whose doctrine of immortality included no return from the underworld to reign with Christ in a visible restored Jerusalem. To say that "our souls when we die are taken to heaven," was for Justin equivalent to blasphemy of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who had promised the patriarchs this reign. How many of us would be able to call ourselves Christians if Justin's standards prevailed to-day?

And yet Justin regards himself on the general question of immortality as a devout disciple of Plato, Pythagoras and other Greek philosophers, though his doctrine is of conditional, not intrinsic or inalienable immortality. "The souls of the pious remain in a better place, while those of the unjust and wicked are in a worse, waiting for the time of judgment. Thus some who have appeared worthy of God never die; but others are punished so long as God wills them to exist and be punished."<sup>2</sup> If we go back another century to a Christian environment scarcely affected by Greek philosophy we shall find a still wider divergence from modern ideas. We shall be approximating those Jewish and Jewish-Christian sources to which Justin had accommodated his Greek philosophy.

The viewpoint of Mark, the earliest of our extant Gospels, is already affected, as I shall later attempt to show, by the teaching of Paul. The same is true of the two subsequent writings whose narrative is mainly based on Mark, the double work Luke-Acts, and the Gospel of Matthew. These writers are affected not only in what they take over from Mark, but to an even greater extent in portions where they depend upon other unknown sources. Nevertheless all three of the Synoptic writings (thus called to distinguish them from the widely differ-

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid. v.



ent, completely Pauline, fourth Gospel) in spite of the Greek dress for which they have exchanged their original Semitic idiom, are fundamentally Jewish in their world-conception and point of view. And the characteristic thing about this Jewish idea of the life to come is that it is not primarily a doctrine of immortality at all. It is really a doctrine of escape from what stood for immortality in primitive Jewish belief. Resurrection in its proper sense means return from the grave to a renewed life in the body,—indeed Justin, and the rest of the second century fathers, who give us the original Greek of the so-called Apostles' Creed say plainly "in the flesh" (τῆς σαρκός.)

*Ressurrection* Jewish-Christian thought may claim as its very own. No Greek thinker will dream of disputing it. The Greek's belief is really a belief in *immortality*. He holds to a persistence of soul-life after death, whether in heaven or elsewhere. He may imagine Isles of the Blest beyond the setting sun, or Tartarus beneath the earth as a place of torment for the damned. He never thinks of return to earth. The Jew is either a Sadducee who admits no persistence at all of conscious soul-life, or else a Pharisee, one of the sect who in the later years of Judaism were driven to admit a return from Sheol, that shadowy realm of ghost-life beneath the earth, of at least the most heroic and deserving of the dead to share in the joys of the messianic reign.

Of course from the moment when Pharisees began to dispute with Sadducees, the question could not fail to be asked, "With what body do they come?" It received various answers. But the essence of the matter was the escape of the soul thus divinely redeemed from Sheol, brought back from the gloomy prison-house of the dead. For indeed the soul's mere persistence after death was deemed a poor boon indeed. In the best of cases it was only a provisional storing up for the glorious "age to come"; in the worst it would be a corresponding holding in chains for ultimate punishment. In all cases immor-

tality alone, for the Jew, means a mere survival of the belief common to all primitive peoples of the ghost-life of the shadow-world. To allege that Jehovah's promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob means no more than this is "blasphemy." For Jehovah, in all Jewish thought both earlier and later, is emphatically not a God of the dead, like Minos or Rhadamanthus, or Pluto, or Hades, but a God of the living. To become members of the kingdom which He intends to inaugurate, the souls of the righteous dead must be delivered from their prison. The gates of Sheol must be broken down before them as when Israel came forth out of the house of bondage and the darkness of Egypt, or as when Jehovah a second time put on the armour of His vindication and deliverance and broke the gates of brass and bars of iron of the captivity in Babylon. Moreover, the returning dead must be clothed with some sort of body, else they will be but pitiful shadows and ghosts, present at the banquet of the Kingdom, but deprived of all real share in it.

In the older days the prophets had been the statesmen of the national religion. Hence necromancy, and the attempt to hold converse with the dead was condemned and denounced along with witchcraft. It involved disloyalty to Jehovah, illicit dealing with the enemy.<sup>3</sup> The very contact with any dead body made one ritually "unclean." Much more was it forbidden to participate in rites symbolizing the death and resurrection of Adonis, or to cut one's flesh for the dead. One might not even meet the thirst of the pitiable shades for momentary renewal of their former existence by pouring for them libations of wine or blood to reanimate their bloodless frames. In the later time all hope of restoration of the national life lay in a supernatural intervention of Jehovah. But mere deliverance of the living from the alien yoke was conceived

---

<sup>3</sup>The remark is a just one that where messianism is strong the hope of immortality is weak, and conversely. The personal hope tends to flourish at the expense of the national.



as but the lesser part of His working. His conquest of the powers of death and hell was the greater part. A late addition to Isaiah<sup>4</sup> promises this deliverance of the dead. In Jesus' time the masses of the people believed that the gates of Sheol would not prevail against the Deliverer, when at last He should come. Their struggle was not so much against the yoke of Rome as "against the principalities and powers in heavenly places" who were "world-rulers of this darkness." The history of this belief in Palestine makes it widely different from that of Greece. It is essentially a return from the grave, a restoration of the spirit to the body; not a release of the soul from the body to enter its natural sphere of immortality somewhere beyond the grave. Israelites who come at last to believe in a share (for at least some of the dead) in the life of "the age to come" do so in spite of centuries of opposition on the part of all the religious leaders of the past to everything pertaining to the nature-worship of the Canaanite religions whose ritual looks toward participation in nature's annual renewal of life. When they accept the doctrine they do so purely and simply on religious grounds, not in the least because they have learned from their philosophers to consider the soul a monad incapable of dissolution, or believe in the conservation of energy in the form of a mysterious force known as vitality. It is simply a reasonable religious hope in Jehovah, a confidence that He will keep His promise to the patriarchs to make their seed His people even should it require His invasion of the gloomy recesses of Sheol and rescue of its prisoners.

Both Greek philosopher and Jewish religious teacher fall back ultimately upon the Animistic view, instinctive to all primitive peoples, that the spirit which leaves the body inert with the parting breath is hovering somewhere about, revealing its presence in dreams, capable (if only the right spell were found) of being recalled to its accus-

---

<sup>4</sup>Is. 26-27. See especially 26:19.

tomed haunts and ways. The Greek philosopher finds a rational ground for the ancient belief. He argues from the nature of soul as ethereal and indestructible. The Jewish teacher takes refuge in the power and goodness of Jehovah, whom he personifies as champion of his imprisoned people. Both postulate immortality in the sense of continued existence of the soul; and the Jew is even truer than the Greek to the primitive form of the belief, since he scarcely advances beyond the conviction that this life of the "shades" is, and must ever remain, a poor, weak, bloodless existence, more pitiable than that of the lowest menial in the upper regions of sunlight and the zest of life. "Art thou become weak like one of us?" cry the peering shades in Isaiah 14:10 as Nebuchadnezzar is "brought down to Sheol." But the Greek tries to reconcile himself to this inevitable fate. He paints scenes of delight in the Elysian Fields or fables Gardens of the Hesperides. He even persuades himself by his philosophy that he is better off without the body. The cumbrous flesh is but the prison of the soul. As the butterfly emerges from the chrysalis to soar on wings of beauty in the light, so will it be for the spirit when it frees itself from the clay. It will find itself in its true environment, and recognizing at last that the things which are seen are temporal, the things not seen eternal, will marvel that ever it mistook shadow for substance, and rejoice that the illusion is past. So the Alexandrian-Jewish author of Wisdom of Solomon (9:15). But this author, like Philo, Platonizes.

It is the opposite road that is taken by genuinely Jewish faith. So long as it is true to itself it is never reconciled to the shadow life. In the later time, when it is forced to meet the scoffs of Greek philosophy at its crude picture of the coming age, it changes here and there a detail, or adapts itself where it must. It borrows from Persian and Greek a Paradise and a Gehenna, thus providing preliminary limbos of partial bliss for the righteous, fore-



tastes of perdition for the wicked. It accommodates its doctrine of physical restoration to the unsuitability of this earthly frame, especially if crippled or mutilated here, making certain qualifications and provisos to meet the ideal conditions assumed for the "age to come." For purposes of recognition all bodies when they first arise will retain their earthly blemishes and imperfections. As soon as friends have identified one another these will be miraculously removed. All bodies will be perfect. Since there should no longer be need of the command "Increase and multiply and fill the earth" those who have a share in the "age to come" will be uni-sexual.<sup>5</sup> Other adjustments and accommodations are found, as difficulties are suggested by reflexion or cast up by opponents. All these are mere expedients, evasions rather than answers, to the question, "With what body do they come?" Ever the hope of the Jew is against separation from the land he loves and the bodily life that to him is alone real "life." He cannot be satisfied while a realm remains outside the dominion of Jehovah, holding captive those who once had been loyal subjects of Jehovah's rule. The Greek makes the most of his "immortality." The Jew either will hear nothing of life beyond, or he insists upon "resurrection." He must have return from among the dead. First the Kingdom of God, the supremacy of God's will upon the earth, in the presence and with the participation of all His people. After that add what you will.

## II. THE TEACHING OF JESUS IN GALILEE.

Encounter with Sadducees was a great exception in the ministry of Jesus. In Galilee, at least in the humbler circles among whom Jesus lived, there would seldom be seen one of the priestly aristocracy of Jerusalem. Even in Jerusalem Jesus would have little occasion for

---

<sup>5</sup>Eth. Enoch 1:4; Apoc. Bar. 49-51. "They shall be made like unto the angels."

any interchange with the Sadducean priesthood save as He roused their hostility by exciting messianic agitation liable to bring on Roman intervention to the taking away of their tolerably comfortable place and partial control of the nation. As a rule, therefore, we cannot expect in the Galilean ministry any record of argument in proof of a doctrine which the mass of Jesus' hearers would accept as matter of course. We must consider first His ordinary teaching, afterward the exceptional case.

The matter-of-course references to the future life, if I may so designate those in which Jesus merely takes for granted the traditional beliefs of His hearers, are all, I think, of one class. They are all appeals to the great moral law of retribution which Paul summarizes in the ancient proverb, "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." They reenforce the motives to right living of the old-time prophets by extending the boundaries of Jehovah's kingdom without limit either in time or space. "Fear not those that kill the body, but fear Him that hath power to destroy both soul and body in hell."<sup>6</sup> Learn the higher use of money. A mere swindling steward is shrewd enough to know that by making concessions to the landlord's creditors he can feather his own nest for times of adversity. Let us take the hint that friendship and gratitude are powers that can bridge even the grave. "I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness, and they will receive you in the eternal habitations."<sup>7</sup> So Jesus broadens and deepens moral motives by the power of an endless life. He bids the self-indulgent rich realize that the moral law outlasts all provision for fleshly appetite, and remember that a time is coming when the starveling at his gate may have the comforts and he the torment. To the penitent thief

---

<sup>6</sup>Cf. *Aboth* R. Nathan 24, the saying of R. Jochanan b. Zacchai on the greater terrors of the divine judgment.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. the rabbinic teaching cited by Nork (*Rabb. Quellen*, p. 147) from the preface of *Chesed Samuel* 2b "The poor make intercession on behalf of the (charitable) rich in heaven."



he offers a share in His own place in the Father's house. These teachings are not new so far as they merely presuppose the common Pharisean doctrine of the "Age to Come." They are to be studied for two purposes: first, that we appreciate their essential message, the true new principle that Jesus applies to the conditions He confronts; second, that we may avoid a certain misuse of them that is very common. We must cease to draw from them unwarranted inferences in matters that do not concern the message, but are only part of the common background of current belief.

Let me give first an illustration of the misuse I have in mind. In Mark 9:43-48 Jesus gives three examples of the relative importance of values in things material as against things eternal. It is better, He says, to enter into life maimed as to right hand, right foot, or right eye, than having every member whole to be cast into the unquenchable fire. I suppose there are no longer any so materialistic in their views of the life beyond as to hold that the possession or lack of hands and eyes and feet at death makes any difference to the spiritual body. Christians will probably now grant that we are not compelled to hold to the presistence of mutilations in the life to come because of the particular from of Jesus' illustration. Even if we assumed because of the ordinary form of belief in His time that He Himself presupposed this conception, we should not consider that He endorsed it. We say quite rightly, He was not talking about the nature of the resurrection body, or its relation to the earthly; He was simply reminding His followers as they faced possible martyrdom that no sacrifice is too costly for entrance into the eternal life. He was measuring the value, as He so constantly does, of things temporal by comparison with things eternal.

But what about the closing verse? Do we apply the same logic there? The warning ends, if you remember, with a characterization of the *Gehinnom* into which those

are cast who are adjudged unworthy to "enter into life." It is "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Is not that a direct endorsement of those lurid pictures we find in the apocalyptic writings of the time, *Ethiopic Enoch*, or the *Apocalypse of Peter*? Does it not imply the eternal torments of the damned? Must we not judge of this as of the great phrase which our first evangelist coins into a refrain five times repeated in his Gospel: "There shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth," or of the awful picture of judgment with which he concludes his account of the public ministry: "These shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life"? Does not Jesus here pave the way for Tertullian, and make Himself sponsor for the vindictive hell of our human craving for vengeance?

If we so reason we are not only, as it seems to me, inconsistent with our own logic, but we do a threefold injustice to the real message of Jesus. To begin with, let me venture a general caveat. We have no right (in my personal judgment) to insist to his extent upon the *ipsisima verba* of the Gospels. They are not only translations of Jesus' originally Aramaic utterances; they are free traditional reports, written down a full generation later, by evangelists who often vary widely from one another in reporting the same utterance. Moreover all scholars will agree that the particular utterances characteristic of our first Gospel which threaten the penalties of hell with such reiteration, utterances of which the great concluding parable of the last Judgment (Matt. 25:31-46) is typical, must be taken to reflect in peculiar degree the special convictions of this evangelist. The passage in Mark 9:43-48, with which we are now dealing, is not indeed to be classed with the special denunciations of judgment characteristic of Matthew, but it is of the Matthean type. It has the same literary structure which characterizes many of Matthew's longer discourses. And this polished artistic form is not easily explained in comparison



with most of the sayings of Jesus, unless we admit some degree of literary recasting by the writer to give rhythmic form, strophic balance and cadence. Especially does the recurrent refrain (verses 43, 45, 47) belong rather to poetic art than to colloquial speech. I am not here propounding an argument which can be pressed to avoid a difficulty, and I do not propose to deal with the record otherwise than as if every word were an exact transcript of the actual utterance of Jesus. But I do offer a warning to those who attempt to build on particular words and phrases rather than on underlying principles. Jesus Himself would have rested only on the underlying principles, since He never took the trouble to write out a body of precepts. Fortunately the great principles of His teaching are really determinable, in spite of variability in the report.

Returning, then, to the threefold refrain. "Having two hands, two feet, two eyes, to be cast into hell," what shall we say as to the closing utterance attached in Mark 9:48, "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched"? Is not this an endorsement of the doctrine of endless torment?

First of all we note that the clause is a simple quotation of the last words of Isaiah, where the prophet depicts the safety and peace of the redeemed city. Its inhabitants look forth with infinite relief and thankfulness upon the heaps of offal and refuse swept out upon the dunghills of the southwestern valley, Gehinnom—Aceldama of the later time. The elements of evil have met a destruction so complete that they can never plague the city again. Jesus borrows this Isaian imagery of decay and burning not for the purpose of insisting upon the particular nature of the doom that is to overtake the wicked, but (as usual) to reinforce His appeal to men to choose the higher values. He uses for this purpose the higher lights and deeper shadows of the "age to come." We do injustice to His real message if we fail to remember (1)

that we have no right to insist upon the ipsissima verba of the evangelists' later reports, without carrying them back to the general underlying principles of Jesus' teaching; (2) that we ought to differentiate between the new lesson Jesus is trying to bring home, and that which is mere assumption by common consent among all parties at the time, such as the Isaian picture of the dung-heaps of Gehinnom outside the new Jerusalem, which *Ethiopic Enoch* develops at great length. In this case the new lesson is simply the futility of seeking to save one's life in this world if thereby one loses it unto life everlasting. We must remember (3) that Jesus as well as Paul was an opponent of the letter that killeth, and an advocate of the Spirit that giveth life.

I have dwelt at some length upon this particular Galilean teaching of Jesus because I believe it to be typical of all. It certainly affords a fair example of that misuse of the records which I deprecate, because here as much as anywhere men are disposed to cling to the husk and disregard the kernel. But I think it is also typical of all because it shares with the rest of Jesus' appeals to the current eschatology the fundamental purpose of deepening the significance of moral distinctions by indefinitely enlarging the sphere of their application. "Reward in heaven," hopeless remorse in the "outer darkness." These are not new doctrines forming part of the individual message of Jesus. They are axioms of the faith in which both He and His auditors have been brought up, but whose implications His generation have failed to fully realize.<sup>8</sup> Jesus appreciates their full significance, because He has a sense of the infinite value of human personality which they do not share. Their belief in a resurrection, limited (it would seem) at first to the supremely heroic and deserving, rested, it is true, historically upon similar ground. They had come to know "souls that were not

---

<sup>8</sup>A century later we find R. Jochanan b. Zacchai making similar application of the new doctrine. Cf. *Berachoth* 28b.



born to die," heroes and martyrs who had given their lives for God's Kingdom, and could not be excluded from it. On this ground they had begun to cherish the new hope, but without consistent application. Jesus applied the principle of human worth consistently. "Not a sparrow falleth to the ground with out your Father."<sup>9</sup> He clothes the lily. He feeds the ravens. Are not ye much better than they? Therefore ask, and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock—knock even at the gate of heaven—and the doors of your Father's house shall be opened unto you. Jesus accepts and applies the doctrine of the Pharisees. But He does not give the endorsement of His own authority to the details of the conception, the place of torment for the unmerciful, Abraham's bosom (that is, a reclining-place next to Abraham on the couch before which the messianic banquet is spread) as compensation for those that suffered her undeservedly. He uses these conceptions because as a whole they are in line with His own consciousness of the value of a human soul in the sight of the heavenly Father. But the *lesson* lies elsewhere. The parable of the rich man and Lazarus does *not* teach anything as to the particular nature of reward and punishment in the world to come. It *does* teach that what we see in this world of the distribution of happiness and wealth is not the last word upon the subject. There is something more to the divine justice than can be inferred from earthly experience. Whether Jesus had ever read that great Alexandrian-Jewish argument for immortality, the Wisdom of Solomon, I cannot say. The parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus does show, however, that Jesus would have heartily welcomed the noble faith of this Alexandrian poet-philosopher in its expression of the conviction that immortality is necessary not merely to give room for the real greatness of finite moral

---

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Simon b. Jochai in *Bereshith R.* §79, f. 77, col. 4. "No bird falls from the sky without the decree of heaven. How much less can danger beset the life of a man save by permission of the Creator?"

beings, but also to give room for the adequate self-expression of a moral Creator.

Because God created man for immortality,  
 And made him an image of His own proper  
     being (cf. II Cor. 5:5) . . .  
 But the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God,  
 And no torment shall touch them.  
 In the eyes of the foolish they seemed to have died;  
 And their departure was accounted their hurt,  
 And their journeying away from us their ruin:  
 But they are in peace.  
 For even if in the sight of men they be punished,  
 Their hope is full of immortality:  
 And having borne a little chastening, they shall  
     receive great good.  
 Because God made trial of them and found them  
     worthy of Himself.  
 As gold in the furnace He proved them,  
 And as a whole burnt-offering He accepted them.  
 They that trust on Him shall understand truth  
 And they that keep faith in love shall abide in His  
     presence.<sup>10</sup>

### III. JESUS' TEACHING IN JERUSALEM

Thus far I have spoken only of the implications of Jesus' utterances when He and His hearers occupy common ground, accepting the modernist doctrine of the time, the Pharisean doctrine of return from Sheol (at least for some of the worthiest of its occupants) to share in the glories of the messianic age. We have now to consider the single occasion on which we hear of the belief being challenged. In Jerusalem, as Jesus was teaching in the temple, "there come unto him Sadducees, who say that

---

<sup>10</sup>Cf. Paul's twice cited extract from *Ass. Mss.* (so Euthalius, Georgius Syncellus, and MS. of the xi. cent.) in Gal. 5:6, "faith working through love" the only ground of acceptance.



there is no resurrection.” Against the scoffing objection raised by these Jesus is obliged to make good His acceptance of the belief itself.

The objection presupposed only the cruder form of Pharisean doctrine, in which the resurrection body was assumed to have the same substance, form, functions, and relation to its environment as its predecessor. Accordingly it was not difficult to answer. From what we know of the answers made at the time to the question, “With what body do they come?” it is probable that most intelligent Pharisees would have taken substantially the same ground as Jesus. He explains, you remember, (1) that the life hereafter is the gift of an almighty Creator who is not limited to the forms of which we happen to have had experience; (2) that the angels are not supposed to have families, and that in the age to come marriage may be an obsolete institution.<sup>11</sup> This is a quite adequate rebuttal of the crude objection. But Jesus does not stop here. The significant part of the recorded saying follows after. It is the added rebuke of Sadducean unbelief from the incident of God’s promise to Moses when He sent him to bring Israel forth out of Egypt. This reveals the real basis of Jesus’ faith, as well as that of His people. It shows His insight into the things that belong unto God: “But as touching the dead that they are raised; have ye not read in the book of Moses, in the place concerning the bush, how God spake unto him saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not a God of the dead, but of the living: ye do greatly err.” I must dwell for a few moments on this great utterance.

The later evangelist Luke attaches a clause taken in substance from IV Maccabees 16:25, “For they well knew

---

<sup>11</sup>Cf. e. g. **Ber.** 17a “In the age to come there is neither eating nor drinking, nor marrying, nor envy nor hatred; but the righteous repose with crowns on their heads and are satisfied with the glory of God (cf. Ps. 17:15). See also **Eth. Enoch**, 51:4.

that men dying for God live unto God, as live Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the patriarchs." But Jesus was not here appealing to the Alexandrian belief expressed in IV Maccabees of a special, immediate resurrection of the martyrs to the abode of the patriarchs with God. Hence we cannot admit the Lucan gloss, "For all live unto Him." Again those modern interpreters who think that Jesus is inferring from the use of the present tense, "*I am*," instead of "*I was* the God of Abraham" are still more wide of the mark; for there is no verb at all either in the Greek or Hebrew. And there surely would be, if this subtle distinction of tense were intended. Both in the original and the quotation the utterance is simply: "I, the God of" the fathers. The copula must be supplied. Moreover, we have not, as even our American Revisers render, "the" God of the dead, but "a" God of the dead. Jesus is contrasting the "God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob", with such gods of the dead as Pluto, Hades, Rhadamanthus, Osiris, etc. At "the place concerning the Bush," Jehovah, the covenant-keeping God, had commissioned Moses to bring forth their descendants from the house of bondage, that they might be a peculiar treasure a people for an own possession unto Him. Jesus believes in this promise, which could only be fulfilled when Jehovah reigned supreme in the midst of His own delivered people. And no such redemption was possible unless, as in the days of redemption out of Egypt, Jehovah should manifest the glory of His strength by prevailing over the gates of Sheol. It was because the Sadducees knew neither the Scriptures nor this "power of God," the power shown in His triumph over the powers of the Underworld that they so greatly erred.

To appreciate the real ground of Jesus' argument, and how completely the faith of Israel in His time is based on their hope in God's promise of *national* deliverance, we must place alongside this rebuke of Sadducean materialism the ancient prayer, second of the so-called Eighteen

Blessings. It is among the oldest of all, a prayer as familiar to their ears, no doubt, as the *Shema* itself, the Credo of Israel, with which Jesus answered the question of the scribe immediately after. This well-known Blessing of Jehovah, second of the Eighteen, may not actually have been called The Power of God, but at all events it celebrates Jehovah's power in restoring the nation from death to life after the Captivity, and it makes further appeal to His promise to the Patriarchs. But we must couple together the first two Blessings, probably the oldest of the Eighteen, to bring out the completeness of the connection with Jesus' reply to the Sadducees:

(1) "Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God and the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the great God, the mighty and tremendous, the Most High God, who bestowest gracious favours and createst all things, and rememberest the piety of the patriarchs, and wilt bring a redeemer to their posterity, for the sake of Thy name in love. O King, who bringest help and healing and art a shield.

(Response?) "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the shield of Abraham."

After this follows the Blessing for the Power of God:

(2) "Thou art mighty forever, O Lord; Thou restorest life to the dead, Thou art mighty to save; who sustainest the living with beneficence, quickenest the dead with great mercy, supporting the fallen and healing the sick, and setting at liberty those who are bound, and upholding Thy faithfulness to those that sleep in the dust. Who is like unto Thee, Lord, the Almighty; or who can be compared unto Thee, O King, who killest and makest alive again, and causest help to spring forth? And faithful art Thou to quicken the dead.

(Response?) "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who restorest the dead."



The symbolism for this sublime hymn of confidence in God's faithfulness to His promise to the patriarchs is taken from Ezekiel's vision of the Valley of Dry Bones, from which the broken, crucified, dead nation is raised up when the wind from God breathes upon them, and they rise up an exceeding great army. In the dark times that had come for Israel under an alien yoke the figure had been many times recalled. We have in the fragments of pseudo-Isaian literature a form of it which describes in poetic imagery how "The Lord God descended to his dead people that slept in the dust of the grave, that he might proclaim unto them his own salvation."<sup>12</sup> Paul, in Ephesians 5:14, even quotes a similar hymn in which God does this in the person of the Messiah: "Awake," cries the poet to despairing Israel, "the arise from the dead, and the Christ shall shine upon thee."

But the essential point of resemblance between the utterance of Jesus and the Blessing for the demonstration of God's power in restoring life to the dead, is that both rest upon His faithfulness to His promise to the patriarchs. God had declared that He would make their descendants His "people for an own possession." In the place concerning the Bush He declares to Moses that the time has come. Now if He were "a god of the dead" His "people for an own possession" might be convinced as a vast company of shades, like the pitiable denizens of the empire of the underworld. But neither Jesus' contemporaries nor their forbears could tolerate the idea of Jehovah as a God of the dead. No more than we moderns can logically conceive the Creator, whose very nature it is to give life and breath to all things, turning all back again to primeval chaos, reckless of the values wrought out through æons of evolution, an immutable Absolute enthroned over a lifeless universe. Jesus is appealing to His nation's hope, the messianic hope, the hope and

---

<sup>12</sup>Quoted by Justin Martyr (*Dial.* lxxii.) as from "Jeremiah," by Irenaeus (*Haer.* III, xx. 4) as from "Isaiah."

faith that God *means something* by the vast vicissitudes of history, and that the faith of the generations past that sought the "city that hath the foundations" is not in the end to be put to shame. He takes the nature of God as a *faithful* Creator, that has not made all men in vain, as the ultimate ground of His doctrine of immortality. And because our Christian faith is rooted in this genuine *national* hope of Jesus and His people it can never be merely a hope of immortality, but must be a hope of resurrection. It rests upon the *value* of the individual soul and of human society.

#### IV. THE EFFECT OF CALVARY.

We have considered the teaching of Jesus in its two aspects, first where there is no challenge to the commonly accepted faith, second where He is thrown back to render a reason for the hope that is in Him. In both cases we found that the teaching of the Master is typically Hebrew. It is exactly what we might expect from one thoroughly grounded in the law and the prophets. Indeed it scarcely differs from that of the most spiritual-minded of contemporary Jewish teachers save in going deeper, and laying the foundation in the worth of man and the goodness of God. Even the details of the picture coincide with current conceptions, though we know from the whole course of Jesus' teaching that He wished His disciples to distinguish the weightier from the less vital, and not to be slaves of the letter.

But it was not the *teaching* of Jesus which gave rise to the Christian doctrine of immortality. Paul never dreams of citing any word of Jesus in support of his doctrine, though he does once refer to an unknown saying on the Gathering together of the Elect (a feature of Jewish conceptions of the establishment of the messianic kingdom), to the effect that the living would have no precedence over the dead. We should not expect Paul to cite

teachings. In the nature of the case no Apostle or witness to the Resurrection would think of resorting to sayings of the Master in exposition or vindication of the accepted views of the Synagogue, when he could point to his own visions and revelations of the risen Lord. Jesus had taught them, of course, to think less meanly and ignobly than they had previously thought about the conditions of the age to come; but He had brought life and immortality to light *by the resurrection itself*. All their highest messianic hopes were now proved true since they had seen Him clothed in His resurrection glory, and heard the voice "as of many waters" proclaiming: "Fear not; I am the first and the last, the Living one. I was dead, and behold I am alive forevermore, and hold the keys of death and of Hades." It is the *story of Calvary* which made the Christian religion. The teachings of Jesus were gathered up afterward as a precious treasure of which they had at first not realized the value. Pastors and teachers turn them to account when the churches begin to feel the need of admonition, training and discipline in the way of righteousness; but the Apostles were "witnesses of the resurrection."

However, there is a sense in which we may say that the teaching of Jesus (though not the *public* teaching) was itself the origin of this faith in His resurrection. I do not mean the forewarnings of His fate which the evangelists relate as preceding the last journey to Jerusalem. Whatever the degree of definiteness with which Jesus then placed before them His own assurance of victory even through death, we know that they disregarded it and only recalled it afterward, when they had become convinced by other means that He had been raised again from the dead. It was another utterance which made it possible for them to receive the Easter message. What I refer to is a much more intimate and more unmistakable utterance than any of these warnings on the way to Jerusalem, a saying given under such circumstances that the disciples neither did nor could disregard it.



We know that Jesus' farewell utterance in the upper room, declaring that His body was broken, His blood poured out for the disciples' sakes, and "making covenant" with them in His blood, that they should eat and drink with Him at His table in His Kingdom, was neither forgotten nor disregarded. For, as Paul tells us, the breaking of the bread was observed as a memorial rite "from the Lord himself." The very fact that the words were thus reinforced by symbolic act was a guarantee that though heaven and earth should pass away this farewell message at least should not pass away, but should testify the Lord's own faith "till he come."

It is hardly possible for us to say what effect reports of visions and revelations of the risen Lord might have had on the minds of disciples destitute of any preparation in His own words for a belief in His resurrection. Yet experience would seem to indicate, if indeed the references to His being recognized "in the breaking of the bread," and similar reawakenings of past impressions in the Gospels do not suggest it, that without some such preparatory nucleus personal visions might not have been experienced, and reports of visions granted to others would scarcely have found acceptance. There is, then, a sense in which we may say that it was the private teaching of Jesus Himself which gave rise to the Christian doctrine of the resurrection. If we hold that only hearts made ready could have had the experience we might almost say it was this doctrine which produced the resurrection visions, rather than the visions which produced the Christian doctrine.

But what was this doctrine, or belief, to which Jesus appealed when He declared that His body and blood were "given" for His followers' sake, when He made tryst with them at the messianic banquet? Was it simply the current Pharisean teaching referred to by the sisters in the story of Lazarus, when Martha says with more of resignation than of hope, "I know that my brother shall rise

again in the resurrection at the last day"? If so, there can have been but little connection between the belief and the acceptance of the Easter message. The broken bread would have betokened only a very remote comfort.

But there is reason to think that quite a different belief is here made use of, a belief which looked for no prolonged sojourn in the treasury of righteous souls, or other place of preliminary safe-keeping until "the last day," but for immediate restoration to life and activity; a belief which concerned not the generality, but only those who "died on God's account," who when escape was offered them chose rather the way of martyrdom; a belief, in short, of an immediate "first resurrection," given to those who had willingly dedicated themselves in martyrdom "on God's account." For, according to IV Maccabees 17:18, those who thus dedicated themselves "are already standing before the throne of God, and are living the blessed life; for Moses also saith, 'All who have sanctified themselves'<sup>13</sup> are underneath thy hands.' " It is true that the clause we have just quoted comes from an Alexandrian-Jewish writing of marked affinities with Platonism. Even II Maccabees, where a similar doctrine is expressed at an earlier date, is also probably Alexandrian, though the resurrection of the martyrs is here in bodily form. But both books were written to promote the observance of the feast of Dedication of the temple, a Palestinian feast. Both continue the thought of resurrection as we have it in Daniel, a Palestinian apocalypse of ca. 165 B. C., as a special intervention of God in behalf of exceptional heroes; and both stand midway between this and the New Testament Apocalypse, with its special "first resurrection" of the martyrs, and its representation of them as "underneath the altar," interceding there on behalf of their people. The words of the second martyr in II Maccabees 7:9: "The King of the world shall raise up us who

<sup>13</sup> ἁγιασμένοι cf. John 17:19: "for their sakes I sanctify (ἀγιάζω) i. e. dedicate) myself." The citation is from Deut. 33:3.

have died for his laws, unto an eternal renewal of life" might easily have been uttered by a Palestinian martyr of Jesus' time. Those of the last of the seven in verse 36: "These our brethren having endured a short pain have now drunk overflowing life under a covenant with God" would sound no unaccustomed accent. When the youthful martyr concludes: "But I, as my brethren, give up both body and soul for the laws of our fathers, calling upon God that He may speedily become gracious to the nation," he at least helps us realize how those who sat with Jesus at the farewell Supper must have understood His words when He said: "This bread is my body that is given for you, this cup is the new covenant in my blood that is shed for the many. Do this in remembrance of me." They did not need to be told what it meant that one who for the Kingdom's sake had refused escape when it was open to Him should dedicate His body and blood in martyrdom that God might be propitious to His people and forgive their sin. They were not unfamiliar with the hope of joyful reunion to which the mother of the seven martyrs looks forward, and which Jesus holds before the twelve when He covenants with them that they shall drink the wine of the redemption feast new with Him in His kingdom. We have as yet no definite proof that they accepted the idea current in Alexandrian Judaism at about this time, that such dedicated souls pass at once into the very presence of God, to "live even now the blessed life," and to intercede "before the throne of God" for His people. But we have some indications that such a belief was not distinctive of Alexandrian Judaism alone, but belonged to all sections of popular Judaism, however the later conflict with Christianity may have tended to procure its obliteration from the records of the official Judaism of the Synagogue.

It is no less an authority than the great historian Tacitus<sup>14</sup> who gives it as a Jewish belief that "the souls

---

<sup>14</sup>Hist. V, iff.



of those who perish in battle, or by the executioner, are eternal." This special immortality for heroes and martyrs rests, of course, upon the case of Eleazar, the Arnold Winkelried of Jewish history, who according to I Maccabees 6:44, "gave himself to deliver his people" in the battle against Antiochus, and the other Maccabean martyrs, who perished as Second and Fourth Maccabees relate, at the hands of the executioner. Tacitus could very well know of this peculiar form of the belief in immortality, because there was not only a great annual Jewish feast at winter solstice but even the beginnings of a literature, in celebration of the Maccabean heroes and martyrs. In festival and literature alike resurrection was the central theme.

The very Talmud itself, purged as it is of everything that could be suspected of favouring Christianity, furnishes unwilling witness to this doctrinal fruit of the heroic struggle of the Maccabean times. In Jewish literature of the times contemporary with and immediately following the age of Jesus we have many references to a widespread belief in the assumption to heaven of two individuals corresponding to the "two sons of oil" (R. V. "anointed ones") whom Zechariah sees in vision "standing in the presence of the Lord of the whole earth" and supplying with oil the lamp of remembrance of Israel that stands ever-burning before Jehovah.<sup>15</sup> In Revelation 11:3-13 these are called the "two witnesses" (or "martyrs") of God, and are unmistakably identified with Moses and Elijah. It is their function to descend from heaven before the great and terrible Day of Jehovah to effect the Great Repentance, which, according to Malachi 4:4-6, is to precede the messianic judgment and renewal of the world. When they shall have finished their "prophecy," and the "martyrdom" which will be inflicted on them in Jerusalem by the agents of the Beast "the breath will again be taken up into heaven in a cloud in obedience

---

<sup>15</sup>Cf. Isa. 62:6f.

to "a great voice from heaven" which says "Come up hither." It is well known that our Gospels also furnish many traces of this expectation of the second coming of Elijah, and not a few of the return with him of Moses, to whose supposed taking up into heaven a whole book called *The Assumption of Moses* was devoted, of which some fragments are still extant. Those who are interested in the study can trace much of the long history of this Jewish belief in "The Two Witnesses of Messiah" in Bousset's well-known work entitled *The Legend of Antichrist*. The special point of present interest is simply the ground on which the figure of Moses comes to be associated with Elias in the heavenly mission to prepare for the messianic Judgment.

In less orthodox sources outside the Canon the associate of Elias in the role of "the Lord's remembrancers" seen by Zechariah is Enoch, who like Elias had "never tasted death" but had been "taken up" alive into heaven. Enoch, whom even angels entreat to intercede for them with the Heavenly Judge (*Eth. Enoch* xiii, 4), was an obvious surrogate. But in the New Testament, and apparently in orthodox Jewish circles as well, it is not Enoch but Moses who plays this extraordinary part. Nor can it be accounted for by the currency of any legend regarding Moses similar to the story of the translation of Enoch and Elijah, for the story of the death and burial of Moses in Deuteronomy 34:1-8 does not easily lend itself to such legendary development. On the contrary the legend which we know to have been current was the outgrowth of the belief, not the belief of the legend. Moses, as we know from a host of Talmudic passages, was looked to as the great Intercessor for Israel with God, because at Horeb he had obtained the forgiveness of Israel's sin by the power of his "atonement" (Ex. 32:30-32). The Talmudic comment upon this passage (*Debarim R.* III, 255b) relates that after Moses had prayed "Forgive now their sin, or else, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book (of life) which thou

hast written" God answered him: "Because thou didst offer thy life for Israel in this world, so shall it be again in the world to come. When I shall send Elias to my people thou shalt appear together with him." As Elias, who at Carmel had been Jehovah's agent to "turn the heart of Israel back again" to Himself, becomes in the last days His agent to effect the Great Repentance, so Moses who "offered his life" to make atonement for their sin becomes the partner of Elias in the work of the final Reconciliation.

With these almost forgotten elements of contemporary Jewish faith in mind it will be easier for us to appreciate that the resurrection faith of the first Christian believers was something quite beyond the ordinary expectation of rising again "in the last day," and more like the belief that spread at once in Galilee after the martyrdom of the Baptist, when they began to say of John, "This is Elias that should come," or "John, whom Herod beheaded, is risen again." The new resurrection faith of the followers of the Crucified was not the mere conventional belief of the Synagogue in which they had been brought up. It was not the mere rising again in the last Day, but went back alized faith had sprung, the *special* resurrection for redemption of God's people.

The nature of the appearances which the earliest records describe confirm this view of the origins of our Christian resurrection faith. The "visions and revelations of the Lord" of which we hear were not visitations in the night of some poor bloodless ghost, wandering from the abode of shades; nor do the witnesses describe a mutilated corpse galvanized into a few weeks of forced re-animation. Such conceptions may be left to an obsolete rationalism or to fiction writers of the nineteenth century. The appearances that sent the new faith on its victorious way were not of one issuing from the nether world or from the tomb. What we have of stories of this type is of later date. They concern themselves with the second-



any question of debate ignored by Paul, as to what became of the buried body. He whom the disciples saw came from heaven, clothed in the glory of God, bearing in triumph the keys of death and of Hell. The radiance of His form outshone the noonday sun, and His voice was "as the sound of many waters." The wounds of His martyrdom were there, for by these He made intercession for the saints before the eternal Judge. They saw Him as a new Passover Lamb "in the midst of the throne," standing "as it had been slain"; and they looked for reunion with Him at the wedding feast of the eternal redemption. The witnesses of the resurrection saw what they were prepared to see. But the preparation was that of the parting feast below, renewed as the Memorial of Jesus' "covenant of life"<sup>16</sup> from week to week and from year to year "until he should come again." I say, then, that the experience of Calvary introduced a new factor into the Christian doctrine of immortality.

#### V. FURTHER DEVELOPMENT.

In speaking of the Teaching of Jesus in both its aspects, and of the Effect of Calvary I have not exhausted the information to be drawn from the Synoptic writings alone on the question of the further development of the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection. These writings in their present form are not mere records of transactions of the generation already past when they first saw the light. By the most ancient tradition and by internal evidence as well they are documents of the post-apostolic age. Their underlying material is translated from older Aramaic records and gives us trustworthy report of the teaching and life of Jesus in its main outline and substance. But not without evidences of the intervening time of discussion and interpretations as well. During the lifetime of Paul, as we know, the air was full of de-

---

<sup>16</sup>II Macc. 7:36.

bate as to the nature and implications of this new-found faith. If already in Judaism the doctrine of return from the grave had precipitated conflicts as to the conditions and environment of that life of the "age to come," if Alexandrian and Palestinian Judaism were already at odds as to whether when we die our souls are taken to heaven, or whether our souls return from Sheol to the surface of the earth, how much more when the resurrection doctrine in Christian form came directly in contact with the Greek doctrine of immortality. The question "With what body do they come?" is one of those which no teacher in the days of Paul could possibly avoid, least of all Paul himself. Fortunately a discussion of this subject will be given in the present series by a scholar of ample qualifications. You will have opportunity to perceive how Paul accommodates his own conception of resurrection and the life of the age to come, a conception based indeed upon Pharisean teaching but in everything conformed to his personal vision of the risen Christ, to Greek ideas of immortality. The essence of it is what he designates "transfiguration" (*μεταμορφούμεθα*), or "conformation" of the body of humiliation into the likeness of the "body of glory" of the risen Christ, because in the nature of the case "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." This is his answer to those who ask "With what body do they come?" The "tabernacle" of perishable flesh must "put on" the imperishable "building" of God reserved for each believer eternally "in heaven." It is an adjustment, or compromise, between the extremes of a Greek doctrine of bodiless immortality in heaven, and a Jewish doctrine of return to fleshly existence upon earth. As we shall see, it was more than a century before the two elements in the church came to even partial agreement on this question; and then they compromised on a doctrine more Jewish than Pauline. But our own enquiry passes over the Pauline period of debate. We are to re-

sume at the beginning of the post-apostolic age, an age in which Church teachers on both sides, Jewish-Christian and Hellenistic or Alexandrian, are doing their best to meet the same questions as Paul. They use largely the same ideas as Paul, and to some extent even the same phraseology. The story of the Transfiguration, which teaches the reluctant twelve that the true goal of the Christ is to lead the way to the glorious mode of existence of "the men who had been taken up"<sup>17</sup> not to abide on the earth provided with perishable "tabernacles," is an example of interpretation by apocalyptic imagery of the inward significance of the doctrine of a suffering Christ. It is what the Synagogue would call a "midrash" on the story of the Confession of Peter to which it is attached in Mark 9:2-10. This represents Jewish-Christian incorporation of Pauline teaching, in the secondary strata of Synoptic tradition. Over against it, in the great Pauline Gospel given out at Ephesus, the headquarters of the Pauline mission field, toward the close of the first century or beginning of the second, the so-called Gospel of John, we have a different combination of the same two elements. In the Fourth Gospel the writer has made the entire history of Jesus one comprehensive Transfiguration story, going back through Mark not to Peter but to Paul, the Apostle of a "Christ not after the flesh." But of these post-Pauline developments I have no time to speak now. They must be reserved for treatment in another Lecture on "The Johannine Doctrine of Immortality."

---

<sup>17</sup>So Moses and Elias are designated in II Esdr. 6:26. In contemporary Jewish and early Christian apocalypse they are the "two witnesses" of Messiah, or "advance patterns of immortality" (Irenaeus, *Haer.* V, v. I) having been already transfigured into the glory-body.



## PAUL'S BELIEF IN LIFE AFTER DEATH.

BY FRANK CHAMBERLIN PORTER.

The apostle Paul was certainly one of the very greatest of those who through the ages have believed in a future life for man. One naturally thinks of him, among ancients, by the side of Plato. Is there indeed a third who can be put with these two for the quality and value of their testimony and the extent and permanence of its influence upon mankind? We naturally ask them both, not with curiosity but with reverence, why they held this belief, how they conceived of life beyond death, of its nature and of the conditions upon which men can hope to attain it. They differ widely and even radically in their grounds and in their conceptions. Plato's doctrine was the immortality of the soul in contrast to the body. Paul argues in direct opposition to this for the resurrection of the body, although he opposes also the current Jewish conception that flesh and blood can inherit the kingdom of God, and must add the word "spiritual" in order to make the idea of resurrection correspond to his experience of the resurrection of Christ. The grounds of all of Plato's arguments are found in the nature of the soul; the one ground of Paul's assurance is the historical fact of Jesus Christ, His death and resurrection, and the experience already in part present, though also a matter of hope, of the dying and rising of Christians with Him. Whether this difference precludes any real relationship between the testimony of Paul and that of Plato is one of the questions which the study of Paul's thought naturally suggests. For the present it is enough to point out a likeness between the two which is important for the understanding of both. In both it is possible to trace a change, perhaps a development, from writings of earlier to those of later periods. But of both it is certainly true that the fact of their hope, the persistence and assurance

with which they held to it, is of more value to us than the arguments by which they defended it or the terms in which they defined it. We desire proof in this matter, and sometimes seek it in dubious ways, through some sort of evidence of the senses, or some supernatural phenomenon that forces our doubts back and enables us to rest our faith on authority. But for most of us the age of authority in that sense is past. If we are to have convictions about the unseen world and the unknown future we cannot accept them on the bare testimony of those who claim to have seen what lies beyond the perception of common men, or to have been in regions inaccessible to others. Even for our hope in life after death we must find grounds in human nature and points of contact in our own experience if we are to justify belief. We must look within, not without, for our evidence. Confirmation, indeed, can come from without; and the greatest confirmation, the best aid to faith, is the experience and testimony of men of the highest intellectual and spiritual quality. Human nature and human experience at their highest and best reveal our own natures to us, create in us like experiences, and confirm our trust in our best hopes and deepest insights. The language and methods of argument of Plato and of Paul belong of necessity to their own times. What is of greatest and most permanent significance is the fact that these two men, representing at the very highest the intellectual and ethical greatness of the two races and cultures that are the main sources of our own spiritual life, agree in the intensity of their interest and in the persistence of their belief in the immortality of man.

Matthew Arnold truly said that we shall always need the Old Testament because we shall always need the enthusiasm of Israel's conviction that the power not ourselves makes for righteousness, and that to righteousness belongs blessedness. The Old Testament has not many arguments for theism, and meets few of the difficulties to

faith in one God by convincing proofs; but the prophets and poets of Israel were great spirits, and their hold upon God was living and confident. God was their light and joy and strength; and they are themselves our greatest help to faith, as their inner life expresses and imparts itself in words that glow with joy in God and love for Him. In some such way Paul's witness to the hope of life after death makes its appeal. His are the words we like to read in the presence of death; and we read them not for the arguments they contain nor for the details they set forth but for the enthusiasm of their confidence, for their emotional quality and appeal. We need and shall continue to need for our faith in immortality the enthusiasm of Paul's conviction that even death cannot separate us from the love of God. Everything that Paul says about life after death is touched with emotion; and the fact that he was a very great man of religion, a great Christian, gives to the confidence and enthusiasm of his hope the right to be contagious and reassuring.

We have our own questions that we should like to ask of so great a man who has so sure a confidence; and there are other questions which as historical students we are obliged to ask. For ourselves I think there are especially three matters about which we want to know the normal attitude of the human mind, the reaction natural to the mind at its best. First, does pre-existence in any sense underlie man's survival of death? To Plato, and perhaps we may say to the Greek mind in general, pre-existence corresponds to immortality, and is surer, as being a thing experienced, than that which is still future. Second, is it the self-conscious personality that survives, or does immortality mean a return to our source in the divine nature, or a re-absorption in the race or in the universe? Third, what is there in present experience that anticipates the future and justifies us in saying that the ground for our hope lies within and not in a purely outward revelation? We shall not be disappointed in the expecta-



tion that Paul throws light directly or by implication on these problems of our own.

It is of course to be freely recognized that we shall not understand the language of Paul about this or any other matter unless we read it in the light of the ideas of his inheritance and environment. This is so fully recognized now that I am more anxious to urge sympathetic response to that emotional quality in Paul's language to which I have referred, and to avoid the danger of forgetting that poetic and prophetic speech is not bound too closely to the letter.

From the Old Testament Paul may have derived some fundamentals of his faith in the future, in spite of the fact that the Old Testament is almost entirely concerned with the present life. The conception of Sheol never became a starting point for hope but remained wholly negative, the very embodiment of hopelessness. It was just so with the Greek Hades. The element of hope in the Old Testament religion centers in the nation, and is the expectation of Israel's independence and rulership over mankind. It is necessarily, therefore, a hope for the present world; and when at the end of the Old Testament period the claim of the individual made itself felt, this could only take the form of the hope of resurrection, the return of the dead to a fully human life on earth and a share in the glory of the nation. That resurrection rather than immortality of the soul should remain natural to Hebrew thinking rests also on the fact that the Hebrew conception of the nature of man did not allow the idea that the soul could live apart from the body. Before Paul's time, however, some Jews had developed the conception that men would rise with angelic rather than earthly natures, their bodies being fashioned of light or glory, a conception of which perhaps the most natural image was given to the senses by the starry heavens. Paul's conception of the spiritual body has therefore some connection with earlier Jewish thought which develop as a part of a more heaven-

ly conception of the Messianic consumation.<sup>1</sup> Because of the cases of Enoch and Elijah, and Israelite would be prepared for the possibility that God might take men to Himself without death; but such translation remained wholly exceptional.

Another important Old Testament point of connection for Paul's thought is found in the word "spirit." The spirit of God is the divine breath that gives man life. It is always a divine element in man. When God takes it back to Himself the body returns to dust and the man dies; "in that very day his thoughts perish" (Psa. 146: 4). When we read, "and the dust returneth to the earth as it was, and the spirit returneth unto God who gave it" (Eccles. 12:7), this does not mean immortality, for the spirit is not the man himself. Nevertheless when Jews under Greek influence came in touch with the idea of the immortality of the soul they found it more natural to connect personality with this spirit which comes from God and returns to God than to think of the soul (*nephesh*), which was to them simply the living man, the man himself, as surviving death.

Still another foundation for belief in life after death in the Old Testament, and the most vital of all, was the experience of living communion with God, which seems to become first fully conscious of itself in Jeremiah, and finds wonderful expression in some of the Psalms. It is remarkable that this experience could be so deeply and intensely felt as it is, for example, in the seventy-third Psalm without bringing with it the demand and the certainty of continuance after death. This is explained perhaps by the persistent dominance, even in Jeremiah, of the nation as the object of God's supreme care and the heir of His promises.

In the post-canonical Jewish literature of New Testament times we naturally look for interactions between the Hebrew and Greek ways of regarding death and the

---

<sup>1</sup>See Dan. 12:3, and especially Apoc. of Baruch, 50-51.

future and we expect to find some anticipations of Paul's attitude, remembering that he was a Jew of the dispersion whose native language was Greek but his education that of a Palestinian rabbi. It is interesting to find in the Apocalypse of Enoch, in one section, the Similitudes, a conception of the future in which the spiritual world quite takes the place of this earth as the place of the consummation; and the conception of the resurrection is correspondingly spiritualized. In another section (chapters 91-105) we find an assurance of eternal life for the spirits of the righteous which surprises us in a Palestinian and probably Semitic writing, and seems to suggest that the Greek way of looking at the future life sometimes found for itself a place in the native Jewish mind. The Wisdom of Solomon is particularly interesting because of the possibility that Paul was influenced by it, and in any case because it was written by a man like Paul who wrote in Greek but still thought prevalingly as a Jew. The writer of Wisdom knows the sort of denial of immortality which Plato also combats, the view that when the body turns to ashes the spirit is dispersed as thin air; but he does not answer this argument by the effort to prove that the soul is immaterial. It is with a religious faith not a philosophical argument that he meets this scepticism. He affirms that God did not make death, but that men bring it upon themselves by sinful choice; that righteousness is immortal; that the righteous only seem to die; and that man can attain immortality and nearness to God by love and obedience to wisdom. There is here no suggestion of resurrection, although there is no emphasis on the soul as immortal, but only on immortality as belonging to righteousness and to the religious ascent of the soul toward God.

Philo is a Jew who not only speaks Greek but thinks much more as a Greek than as a Jew in spite of the fact that the Pentateuch is his text-book. Philo knows his Plato and also that later Platonizing Stoicism which accepted



immortality. He adopts the theory of the preexistence of souls, and regards their descent into human bodies as at least a calamity if not a sinful choice. But he is not interested in immortality as merely the soul's escape from the prison of the body into its native ether and the purity of its original freedom from contact with matter. It would carry us much too far to discuss his treatment of immortality in detail. Immortality belongs properly to God, while man is the mortal race. It belongs to the Logos and to the world of ideas, in contrast to the world of sense; to the genus also in contrast to the individual. The philosopher attains immortality in so far as he is able to rise into the world of the immortals, that is to abstract himself from the body and outward things and lose himself in contemplation of truth and goodness. This ascent of the soul to God is its ascent to virtue as well as to knowledge; and seems in certain passages to bring with it a real immortality; yet one is left in the end with some uncertainty as to the persistence of the human personality itself. It is certain that Philo does not emphasize the hope of immortality as a motive, and that he seeks in this life that escape from the material world and from the body which is the soul's salvation and blessedness.

Of the Hellenistic mystery religions which offered escape from death by union in a sacramental rite with a God who dies and rises again, something will be said later on.

As we turn back again to Paul we are impressed anew with the vividness and power with which he held to the hope of life after death, its importance to him and the confidence of his conviction. The foundation of his hope is Christ Himself. It is according to Christ that he interprets life after death, and it is because of Christ, in Christ, that he knows it to be a certainty. Paul had seen the risen and exalted Christ; he had seen the man who was crucified as now the heavenly Lord. But behind the

vision there was a knowledge of Jesus which made the vision possible; and after the vision there was an inner experience which meant to Paul that the risen Christ was not only Lord but spirit; and one will misunderstand Paul if he regards his vision as the explanation of his Christianity apart from his knowledge of the earthly Jesus, or apart from his experience that the mind of Jesus was constantly and more and more filling his nature, displacing his old self and forming itself within him. Paul's belief in the life after death is not only an inference from the resurrection of Christ but is inseparably bound up with this abiding, progressive re-creation of Paul's inner life by the spirit of Christ and after the likeness of Christ. The fundamental principle of Paul's Christianity is that Christ is altogether, from beginning to end, what the Christian ought to be, and what because of Christ he now can be, and is, and will be. His doctrine of resurrection is therefore simply the doctrine of the Christian's likeness to Christ.

The passages with which studies of Paul's doctrine of the future usually most concern themselves are 1 Thessalonians 4:13-5: 11; 1 Corinthians 15; 2 Corinthians 5:1-10; Philippians 1:19-26. The necessity of a careful study of these passages is evident; yet it is possible that too exclusive occupation with these sections may lead one to a better understanding of primitive Christian eschatology than of the thoughts most original with Paul. It is certain that these passages need to be interpreted in the light of many others found in all parts of his writings. It will serve our purpose to look briefly at the passages just named. In the first of them Paul answers the fear lest those who die before the Parousia will miss their share in the glory of the consummation, that is fellowship with Christ. Paul answers that Christ's resurrection makes certain the resurrection of His disciples; that "we that are alive" will have no advantage over those who have died; that the destiny of all alike is to be "ever with

the Lord''; that we should live meanwhile in the light of this exception and in preparation for this hope, that is that we should live together with Him now in order that we may live with Him then. Christ's resurrection is therefore the proof that we shall rise, and fellowship with Christ is the nature of the Christian life as well as its final goal.

In 1 Corinthians 15 the same fears are answered. Christians, dead and living, will fare alike at the coming of Christ, the living being transformed into the same heavenly, spiritual natures in which the dead will be raised. But here Paul has especially to confute the position of Greek Christians who believed in the immortality of the soul but not in the resurrection of the body, to whom the resurrection of Christ was either an exception or only an appearance. He meets this antipathy by a sort of compromise between the Hebrew idea of the resurrection of the body and the Greek conception of the immortality of the soul. No doubt the compromise was necessary in order to adjust the Hebrew and the Greek elements in his own mind. He rejects the physical conception of resurrection which on the whole prevailed in Pharisaic Judaism, but resurrection itself was absolutely essential to his fundamental faith that the future life of man rests upon and is wholly like that of Christ Himself. The strange phrase "spiritual body", which would seem a contradiction in terms to every Greek, was a not unnatural effort on the part of a Greek-speaking Jew to preserve the distinct personality and at the same time free the life of the future from the burden and corruption of flesh and blood. The resurrection of the physical body could not but be repugnant to every one who had in any measure the inheritance of Plato in his veins. But Paul believes that if the physical body is thought of as transformed and spiritualized this repugnance may be overcome. For Paul is vehemently opposed to the Platonic conception of the immortality of the soul, partly no doubt



because he is a Hebrew, but chiefly because it is not according to Christ; it was not the way in which the first believers could have experienced as a reality Christ's life after death; and Paul's own vision of the Lord was necessarily a sense experience, the real appearance of Christ embodied in glory or light. But the resurrection of Christ, which Paul knew from his own seeing just as Peter did and the other disciples, was not, to Paul, His return even for a time to a flesh and blood existence. In this Paul is clearly at variance with later traditions found in the Gospels. Of Jesus it was true that that which was sown was corruptible and that which was raised incorruptible; that it was sown a physical body and raised a spiritual body. Another thing which also the whole argument of this chapter aims to make clear is that Christ's resurrection is typical; that it is not unique except that it is first; but that all who are in Christ will rise just as He did. "As we have borne the image of the earthly (Adam), we shall also bear the image of the heavenly (Christ)." The present body, which does not rise, Paul calls not physical or material but psychical, a body fitted for the human soul. Soul, *psyche*, the word of honour in Plato's hope, is lowered in Paul, and made inseparable from the physical, to which in Plato it is absolutely contrasted; and the word spirit, *pneuma*, which to the Greeks was more material and less personal than *psyche*, and contained less promise and potency of immortality for man, is exalted and becomes the essential nature of the risen Christ and so of risen Christians; it becomes also as we shall see the expression for that present experience of the indwelling Christ which is already working out the miracle of the Christian's transformation into both the character and the nature of his Lord. It would seem that to Paul the word "body" means individual personality, and is essential in his thought to the distinction and the permanence of the separate self. It is therefore necessary to Christ's heavenly life, and must remain necessary for

that personal communion of disciples with their Lord and with one another which is the essence of the Christian life. As at many other points of difficulty in the understanding of Paul, so in regard to this paradoxical union of body and spirit the clue to the understanding of his thought is to be found in the nature of love, in other words in the personal quality of Christ.

This deep feeling of Paul that the distinct personality which loves and is loved must not be dissolved by death, comes to still more distinct expression in 2 Corinthians 5:1-10. It is a passage of peculiar difficulty and should not be interpreted apart from the chapter preceding and the discussion that follows. It would seem that owing to the serious illness to which Paul refers in 1:8-11, and probably also to the hardships and dangers which he was constantly encountering, Paul now faced the probability that he would himself die before the coming of the Lord; and the passage before us expresses at least his shrinking from the thought of death as a complete separation of soul from body. He longs as much as any Greek for deliverance from the present burdening body of flesh, but he requires a heavenly body in order to keep and to perfect that communion of his real self with Christ which is the only value of life either here or hereafter. What is not clear is whether his longing is for the speedy coming of Christ before death overtakes him, so that the immortal nature may be put on over the mortal without any interval of nakedness, or rather for a beginning even now of that being clothed upon with his heavenly habitation which will make death incapable of interrupting his being at home with the Lord.

In Philipians also Paul looks forward to death, and even desires it as a departing to be with Christ, accepting a longer life in the flesh only that he may magnify Christ by further minstry to his converts.

The passages we have thus briefly reviewed contain many problems and suggest many questions of which we

have not taken account. The questions that are most discussed are, (1) Whether there is a change in Paul between First and Second Corinthians from a more Jewish eschatological form of hope to greater emphasis on inner union with Christ the Spirit; and (2) whether Paul's eschatology remains purely Jewish in its fundamental features, or is influenced either by the philosophy or by the mystery religions of Hellenism.

It has been argued (especially by Schweitzer) that the most essential thing for the understanding of Paul is to see that all his teachings, ethical and theological, are determined by the peculiarity of the short interval between the resurrection and the parousia of Christ in which his own work must be done; and that it is our chief task to attempt, in the light of this, and with the help of occasional hints in his letters, to reconstruct his eschatological scheme by answering such questions as these: Are there two resurrections or one; one judgment or two? Who are to rise at the parousia? Does judgment take place then? What is the relation between judgment and election? What is the relation between judgment and election? Can believers who fall lose their final blessedness? Is there a general resurrection? When are the elect to judge angels? Such questions, I cannot but think, indicate an external and remote attitude toward Paul himself.

There are other passages, many of them, besides those referred to, in which Paul expresses in varying terms but with clearness and emphasis the things that he is most anxious to have his converts understand and make their own. The following are some of the many passages of fundamental importance for the understanding of Paul's doctrine, passages which need to be read and reread and understood even more through sympathy and spiritual response, through tact and insight, than through comparison with contemporary eschatologies and current conceptions of the world: Galatians 2:19-20; 5:16-6:10, 14; Romans 6-8; 14:7-8; 1 Corinthians 3:21-23; 2 Corinthians



1:8-10; 3:17-18; 4:1-5:19; 13:3-4; Colossians 2:20-23; 3:1-17; Philippians 1:20-25; 2:1-11; 3:10-14, 20-21.

It would be better to read these parts of Paul's letters and let his words have their natural effect upon us than to discuss, as we must proceed to do, some of the questions they suggest. Words such as these impart not only truth, but a great and distinct personality; and yet not only a particular personality, but universal truth, "truth not individual and local, but general, and operative; not standing upon external testimony, but carried alive into the heart by passion; truth which is its own testimony." For this man is not only a great disciple and prophet of Christ, but a creator of Christian experience and of the language in which it can be expressed and imparted. He is a great Christian poet; and one is tempted to quote Wordsworth further because the application of his words to Paul is so exact and illuminating. The poet "is a man speaking to men: a man, it is true, endowed with more lively sensibility, more enthusiasm and tenderness, who has a greater knowledge of human nature, and a more comprehensive soul, than are supposed to be common among mankind; a man pleased with his own passions and volitions, and who rejoices more than other men in the spirit of life that is in him; delightful to contemplate similar volitions and passions as manifested in the goings-on of the universe, and habitually impelled to create them where he does not find them,"—it would be difficult to describe better the author of the eighth chapter of Romans or the fourth of Second Corinthians. Further Paul is a genius of the sort that "sends the soul into herself, to be admonished of her weakness, or to be made conscious of her power." And with such a writer one can make progress only if "he is invigorated and inspirited by his leader, in order that he may exert himself." Paul is one of those who calls forth and bestows power, who requires and creates in his readers thoughts and feelings like his own.

If now we undertake the often thankless and even perilous task of changing poetry into prose, of looking for intellectual conceptions in words of imagination and passion, there are especially two thoughts in Paul that often recur, and that challenge the mind to grasp them and to test their value. One is the thought that the resurrection of Christ is typical, normal, not unique, the first, but the first of many, a disclosure, therefore, of the reality, the grounds and the nature of man's life after death. The other is the thought that the dying and rising of Jesus is also experienced here and now in the life of every believer, and describes the present moral oneness of the disciple with his Lord. Our questions, therefore, concern especially these two conceptions. How did Paul think of the resurrection of Christ, and, therefore, how of the future life of the Christian? And how did he think of the oneness of the believer with Christ, and especially in what relation to each other did he put present ethical oneness or likeness of character, and future sharing of deliverance from death and transformation into a heavenly nature?

In regard to the first of these questions, a matter of fundamental significance is that it was God who raised Christ from the dead. After the word "Father" (*Abba*), Paul's ruling title for God might almost be said to be, He that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead.<sup>2</sup> The same God who raised up Jesus Christ from the dead will raise us also with Him. We have seen that there is in Paul no doctrine of the immortal nature of the soul, or of that higher part of the nature of all men which Paul calls the mind, or the inward man. There is also no intimation of the preexistence of the soul. Immortality is God's creative act, the work of His power and gift of His grace first to Christ, and then to all who are His. Christ is the first fruits, the first born, the first of many brethren (Col. 1:15,

---

<sup>2</sup>1 Thess. 1:10; Gal. 1:1; Rom. 4:17, 24; 7:4; 6:4; 8:11; 10:7, 9; 7:4; 1 Cor. 6:14; 15:15; 2 Cor. 1:9; 4:14; Col. 2:12, 20; 1:18; 3:3.

18; Rom. 8:29). But Paul accepts the preexistence of Christ, and even, in a few sentences, implies His identity with that divine Wisdom through whom God made the world. Our first thought naturally is that the life after death of one who lived with God before His earthly life is only natural, His resumption of His true nature after the brief interruption of His incarnation. It is surely a matter of great significance that Paul makes no use whatever of the preexistence of Christ as explaining His immortality. It is strange that even though He preexisted in the form of God it should still be necessary that God should raise Him from the dead by a direct act of creative power, exactly as He will raise every follower of His. The account of the life, death and exaltation of Christ in Philippians 2:1-11 is peculiarly striking. He preexisted in the form of God, that is an angelic or divine being; but it was not for this reason that He attained life after death. He did not, because of His divine nature, return at death to His former state. He was not one whose humanity was only an appearance. God raised Him from death and exalted Him to a new place and title greater than He had before because He renounced such honours and powers and chose instead humility and sacrifice, even the death of the cross. In all this He was not unique. Paul describes his experience only in order to enforce the admonition to love and lowliness and to care not for one's own things but also for the things of others. So that what Paul here says of the preexistent Christ does not in Paul's own mind prevent His being fully our example, not only in moral character but even in His attainment of life after death. Nothing is attributed to the preexistent Christ who was in the form of God except precisely that mind humility and compassion which ought to characterize men upon earth; and it was because of this that He lived after death.

A different, less human and personal, conception of the preexistence of Christ underlies those few expressions



of Paul which identify Him with the divine Wisdom. It cannot be doubted, in view of Proverbs 8, Ecclesiasticus 24, Wisdom of Solomon 7, that when Paul says, "There is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him" (1 Cor. 8:6); or, "In him were all things created . . . all things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist" (Col. 1:16-17), he implies that Christ is the divine Wisdom. Such references, however, are few and the thought is not elaborated. We have not yet in Paul so developed a Logos doctrine as in the Fourth Gospel. Moreover in 1 Corinthians 1:24, 30; 2:6, where Christ is called the wisdom of God, it is without any suggestion of an eternal divine hypostasis. It is rather the Gospel itself which is here a divine wisdom in contrast to the pretentious foolishness of Greek philosophy. But perhaps the most striking proof that Paul did not create but only here and there recognized the Wisdom Christology is to be seen in the fact that he makes no use of it as an explanation of Christ's life after death. One who is in reality only the incarnation of the eternal divine Wisdom, the reason, or power, or spirit of God, through which the world was made and in and by which it consists, would not require a divine act to raise Him from the dead. Death could only be His release and return to His former and abiding divine and eternal existence. Paul, must we not say, interprets the Wisdom of God as Jesus Christ, in the sense that in Him men have fully all that knowledge of God and access to Him and experience of His indwelling which such a Jew as the writer of the Book of Wisdom found in that Spirit of Wisdom which fills the world and comes freely in answer to prayer into human lives, making men friends of God and prophets, and imparting its own immortality. But Paul does not so interpret Jesus by the divine Wisdom as to endanger his fundamental principle that Jesus is altogether, from first to

last, that which every Christian can be and should be. The case is somewhat different with the writer of the Gospel of John, although even here the natural logic of the Logos Christology is not carried through. The story of the resurrection-appearances of Christ retains its place; but at many points we are reminded that eternal life belongs to Christ by origin and nature rather than by a special act of God. Christ came from God into human life, and it is but according to His nature that He should return to God. He is always, even while on earth, divine. That His earthly life is real, that the Logos became flesh, that He was really crucified and really rose from the grave, is insisted upon no doubt precisely because there were those who made the natural inference from the Logos doctrine that the earthly life of Jesus was only a seeming, and the death either unreal or the dying of a human being who had been for a short time the bearer of a divine presence, not his own human self. Yet the writer is himself, of course, convinced that Jesus was the incarnate Logos, and in some ways reveals the consequences of this doctrine as Paul does not. Never in John is God spoken of as the one who raised Jesus from the dead. Jesus, on the contrary, is one to whom God has given His own distinctive power of raising the dead, of having life in Himself, and giving life to whom He will (John 5:21-27). The account of the resurrection of Lazarus with its culminating sentence, "I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die," would seem to make his own resurrection unnatural and out of place. We can well understand how in opposition to Docetism the death and resurrection retain their place, but we can understand also the emphasis with which it is said, "I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again" (10:17, 18). It is true that the Son does every-

thing as the Father gives His commandment. It is true also that even in John the oneness of the Son with the Father is to be fully shared by all who are one with Him in love and obedience. Yet it is perhaps not too much to say that John marks a stage between Paul and the later theology which professes to rest upon them both, but in reality departs still more than John from Paul's conception that the death and resurrection of Christ are entirely typical and in every respect parallel to that of all whose life is like His. It is seriously to misunderstand Paul if we fail to recognize that Christ's resurrection was significant for Christ Himself. It signifies His designation as Son of God with power (Rom. 1:4); it was His elevation to the supreme office and title of Lord (Phil. 2:10, 11); through it He became lifegiving spirit (1 Cor. 15:45). All that Christ is to the Christian He came to be through His resurrection.

But why did God raise Him from the dead? About this Paul is explicit. It was because of the mind which was in Him, because of the moral character of His self-renunciation and obedience even unto death, because in lowliness of mind He counted others better than Himself. In other words, Christ attained to the resurrection from the dead through what He was and suffered and achieved, and in this respect also is not removed by the uniqueness of His nature from His place as the first among many brethren.

We have already answered the question in what form or nature Christ was raised; but may still ask what Paul's thought probably was as to the relation of the "spiritual body" to the body that died and was buried. Does Paul's description of the resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15:35ff. enable us to say whether the appearances of the risen Christ to Peter and last of all to Paul himself implied in Paul's mind the empty tomb of Gospel tradition? That the body that arose was not the body that was buried is emphatically affirmed. The relation of the new to the old



is likened to the relation between a grain of wheat and the blade that grows from it. Christians who live when Christ comes are to be suddenly translated, the corruptible putting on incorruption, and the mortal putting on immortality. In so far as Paul's interest in affirming bodily resurrection lies in his Hebraic feeling that to the body belongs the personality it would seem necessary to him to think of the spiritual body as having a real connection, in spite of its radical difference, with the earthly and psychic. Perhaps we can further make an inference in this case from the experience of the Christian to the experience of Christ, reversing the usual order, and infer from the fact that Paul thinks of the Christian as already being transformed into the bodily as well as the spiritual nature of Christ, that the heavenly nature is a transformation of the earthly rather than a complete substitute for it. Yet perhaps all these considerations do not outweigh the opposite impression of Paul's vehement assertion that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." It is not easy to suppose that Paul's conviction that Christ was raised on the third day depended at all upon the discovery of the empty tomb, or involved any knowledge or care as to what became of the fleshly body.

Our second main question concerns the nature of the Christian's oneness with Christ. This is the point at which it is now usual to compare Paul's language with that of various Hellenistic mystery cults of Paul's time and soon after of which we have fragmentary records. The common feature in these Oriental religions which made their way into the Greco-Roman world is the conception that through some ceremony, some magical sacrament, the worshipper may become so identified with a diety, and especially with the death and rising of a god, that he escapes the mortality of human nature and becomes immortal, and in that sense deified. The possibility is not to be excluded that Paul could have known some-

thing about such cults and could have heard the language in which their devotees described their experience of dying and rising again with their god. What his relationship was to such movements it will probably never be possible to know with any certainty or fullness. What can be said with confidence is that Paul here as elsewhere knew how to subject the thoughts and fancies of those about him to the mind of Christ. That which distinguishes the mystical language of Paul from that of the so-called Mithras-Liturgy and other similar records is above all his ethical emphasis. Death is the evil from which the mystery-religions sought redemption. To Paul also death is an evil the fear and burden of which he deeply feels; and it is an evil from which Christ brings redemption. But there is another evil which lies deeper and from which redemption must be sought first. It is sin through which man has been brought into subjection to death, and even the whole creation put in bondage to corruption; and the fundamental Christian experience is not the sense of immortality through union with a divine being, but the sense of righteousness, the feeling of moral capacity, the ability to do the good that one wills, the consciousness that pure impulses have the upper hand over the lusts of the flesh, and above all that unselfishness triumphs over the natural human assertions of pride, envy, anger and hatred. The Christian, then, in Paul's experience is first of all one who because of Christ is making his own the moral nature of Christ; and Paul knows that this transformation after the image of Christ, this forming of Christ in the Christian, means in the end sharing His resurrection.

There are two peculiarities which Paul's language about the oneness of the Christian with Christ suggests, two directions in which apparent opposites come together and seem even fused into one. The transformation of the Christian into the likeness of Christ is on the one side a divine miracle, comparable only to that of creation itself, the work in man of the Spirit of God, which is the Spirit

of Christ, or Christ Himself; but it is at the same time the duty of the Christian, a thing constantly to strive after, never to be certain of, but always to make the object of strenuous endeavour. Paul in one breath tells Christians what they already are, sons of God, spiritual beings, no longer in the flesh, no longer even men, and then urges them to become what they are, to make actual their real nature as Christians by their choices and desires, to suppress by moral effort the passions and self-assertions that are already dead, or to which they have died, because Christ is in them.

The second peculiarity in Paul's thought is found in the relation in which the ethical redemption and the physical redemption of the Christian stand to each other. We should perhaps have expected that Paul would put side by side the influence of the mind of Christ, the power of His example, the divine inworking of His spirit by which His character is reproduced in men, and, on the other hand, the proof derived from His death and resurrection that resurrection and eternal life await the Christian also hereafter; so that we should have first the present conquest of sin through the indwelling spirit, and then for the future the hope of deliverance from death and reunion with Christ in some more outward way as of person with person. But in fact Paul seems especially to like to put these two things together so that they are even sometimes confused or blended, so much do they seem to him to be two aspects of one and the same thing. Dying and rising with Christ means not only nor even chiefly for Paul being raised by God as Christ was from the dead to a spiritual nature like His and to a share in His glory; but it means also and more often dying to sin and rising to newness of life. The death and resurrection of Christ are literally to be repeated in case of every Christian; but they are also to be spiritually experienced or undertaken by the Christian, and they constitute the principle of his inner life. Dying in order to live is the very essence of



the imitation of Christ. Moreover the purifying of the nature from sin and the transformation of the body into incorruption are two processes that go on continuously together. No doubt when one reads the eighth chapter of Roman's one's first impression may be that the Christian has already experienced fully the new inner life of the spirit in which sin has no place, but that he still looks forward in hope to that which is still lacking in his sonship, that is, to the redemption of his body; that only with this will come the full revelation of Christians as sons of God, and that with this the weakness and corruption to which the whole creation is subjected will also be overcome. But Paul does not look at the matter quite so simply as this; for on the one hand the end of sin and the attainment of the spirit of Christ although it is given in the death of Christ and in the spirit of life which the Christian has already received, is nevertheless still to be worked out by man through moral effort; and on the other hand the redemption of the body does not wait altogether for death, but begins and in some mysterious way goes forward here and now.

If we glance at some of the passages that are most characteristic of Paul and have the least connection with anything to be found in the literature of his time we shall understand better than by generalizations the peculiarity, and perhaps get a clue to the understanding, of his characteristic way of looking at the Christian experience. In the sixth chapter of Romans Paul finds that baptism signifies a union with Christ in His death and in His resurrection, an end of the body of sin, a walking in newness of life, and yet at the same time the assurance of future life with Him. Paul's use of these expressions is so free and various that we cannot think that he was bound by a hard and fast interpretation. He writes far more as a poet than as a theologian. But one thing is beyond doubt, that his emphasis is ethical, and that he does not mean Christians to suppose that the death and resurrection of

Christ carry with them by any physical necessity either the moral perfection or the exemption from death that belong to Him. His "therefore" is, "Let not sin reign in your mortal bodies." They are to think of themselves as dead to sin and alive unto God, and then are to act accordingly. Man's redemption from both sin and death is already historically accomplished and is at the same time in both cases future; both redemptions are gracious acts of God, yet both are achieved by man's choice and effort; having been made free from sin we are to make ourselves servants of righteousness; since death has no more dominion over us we are free to attain as servants of God the end, eternal life.

In the eighth chapter of Romans Paul's high self-consciousness as a Christian comes to its supreme expression. He has described the reign of sin, and has brought it certainly into close relation with the flesh, the body and its members, and the law or impulse that resides in these. Now all these are dead, Christians no longer live in the flesh, but in the spirit; because Christ is in them the body is dead on account of the sin belonging to it, but the spirit is life because of righteousness. And then by that quick confusing turn, so characteristic of Paul, death becomes literal death again and life the future resurrection which Christ's resurrection makes certain and His spirit dwelling in us brings about. It is evident that the moral renewal which Christians see in themselves is to Paul the most convincing proof of the physical renewal which is yet to be. The word *spirit* is extremely helpful to Paul in his effort to express both the inwardness and the divine source and quality of what is new in the Christian experience. Since it is divine the spirit is eternal and is a principle of eternal life in man; but since it is the spirit of Christ, it has also the quality of His moral nature and creates likeness to Him in those who possess it. It is the spirit of sonship, enabling man to say "Father"; and having made us sons it makes us thereby heirs with Christ

and sharers with Him both of suffering and of glory. This whole chapter makes it evident that Paul's faith in the resurrection is bound up with His experience that the spirit of Christ is already in the Christian and is already transforming him into the likeness of Christ.

Christians now have to suffer more than other men, and Paul himself more than other Christians; yet this very suffering is only a part and a proof of likeness to Christ. Like His, these are the sufferings of love. Death may be their outcome for the disciple as for the Master, but that Christ was raised from the dead is proof of the love of God and of the certainty that from that love no power, neither death nor life, neither things present nor things to come, can separate us.

A passage that is hardly less great than the eighth of Romans is the fourth of second Corinthians. At the end of the third chapter Paul describes that transformation into the image of the Lord which is effected by the Christian's unveiled vision of His glory or by the presence of the Lord Himself as the indwelling spirit. Then the sufferings of the present life, Paul's own weaknesses and distresses, are interpreted as a bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus that the life of Jesus also may be manifested in our body; a death in him which becomes life in his converts. Our outward man is decaying, Paul says, yet our inward man is renewed day by day, as if he were already experiencing the transformation by which what is mortal is to be swallowed up of life.

The striking way in which the divine and the human, the present and the future are blended in Paul is seen again in the third chapter of Colossians. Christians, Paul says, have been already raised together with Christ. He therefore admonishes them to set their minds on the things that are above, where Christ is. He would have them realize that they have died and that their life is hid with Christ in God; and since this is so he urges them to put to death their members that are upon the earth. Hav-



ing put off the old man and put on the new, he presses upon them the duty of putting away anger and wrath, malice and lying, and putting on a heart of compassion, kindness, and humanity.

One more passage which guards us against neglecting the ethical or substituting a mystical and magical conception as Paul's understanding of the Christian life, is in the third chapter of Philippians. The righteousness which is not his own but is from God by faith, is nevertheless a righteousness that he still strives to attain by every effort to the end of his life. Fellowship with Christ, which is the power of the new life in Him, and also of life after death, is even still some thing to strive after, and he will make no claim that he has attained. "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death; if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Not that I have already attained, or am already made perfect: but I press on, if so be that I may apprehend that for which also I was apprehended by Christ Jesus."

Paul's doctrine of the dying and rising of the Christian with Christ does not, therefore, divide sharply into two doctrines, that of a present complete dying to sin and rising to the fullness of the new and perfect life according to Christ, and that of the future rising from the dead by the deed of God. For on the one hand the perfect life in Christ is not yet fully attained, though Paul likes to assert it in order to kindle the desire to make what is ideally true actual in one's conduct and spirit; and on the other hand the coming transformation of the body is in some way anticipated in the Christian's present experience. Somehow Paul was convinced that his own body with its weaknesses and sufferings, failing and decaying as it seemed to him, was becoming a fitter dwelling place and instrument of the Spirit, freer from impulses that held him to earth and things of sense; although he still

longed for that complete translation through which would come to him a bodily life free from weakness and suffering, and lifted above death, in which the spirit could realize without hindrance its full and perfect life. Many things in Paul's letters remind us that he is not a Greek to whom soul and body are two unrelated natures foreign to each other, the body being but the tomb or prison of the soul. To Paul man is a unity. It is not the body that weighs the soul down and from which relief is sought; the body is capable of redemption. It is even now holy as a temple of God since the spirit of God dwells in it. This helps us understand how it is that the dying and rising of Christ can be to Paul at the same time an ethical experience present and continuous, and also a future physical dying and a rising no longer in the image of the earthly but in that of the heavenly.

We have seen that the experience of the spirit is the present attestation of the truth of the Christian hope. We know from Paul's discussion of the gifts of the spirit that of all the various phenomena in which early Christianity saw proof that a divine power had taken up its abode in man, Paul values most those that were most in accordance with the character and purposes of Jesus, those that most conducted to the unity and to the upbuilding of the Christian brotherhood. It is certain that to Paul the supreme proof that Christ had risen and therefore the proof of life after death was the experience that Christ's spirit in him and in other Christians was creative of a new moral nature, that in Christ the old man, the sinful nature, had died. "If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold they are become new." Paul is one of the most confident and greatest of all witnesses for hope in immortality; and the ultimate ground of Paul's hope is not his vision of the risen Christ but, deeper than that, his experience of the spirit of Christ as the creator of a new moral nature. What shall we say, then, of this foundation on which

Paul's structure stands? Is it indeed so firm a fact that it can sustain the faith that he founded upon it? Paul himself had to face the fact that Christians did still sin. He urged them to be in reality by moral effort and achievement, that which they were ideally in the thought of God, in their true life which is in Christ. Paul no doubt sometimes put the experience of newness of life in strong terms expressing his exultation of feeling and his deep sense of gratitude. But when we look at his life as a whole, at the richness and fullness of his Christ-likeness in love and sacrificial devotion, we are ready to accept his testimony that in Christ he was a new being, that he no longer lived but Christ lived in him. For ourselves the truth of the ideals of Jesus and the power of His personality to reproduce itself in the disciple, His capacity to become the spirit of life, the spirit of love, in human beings, remain realities, the greatest realities in the religious life. Paul is often criticized for his apparent neglect of records of Jesus' earthly life and teachings. Yet the thirteenth chapter of first Corinthians is a marvelous character-sketch of Christ and is entirely inexplicable except as the result of His earthly life. It is wholly owing to Jesus that Paul goes so far in the direction of giving ethical meanings to the religious language, traditions, institutions of his time. Certainly the greatest thing in Paul is his reinterpretation of religion in accordance with the character of Jesus of Nazareth. He is not deceived in thinking that his life reflected the glory of the Lord and was being transformed into the same likeness from glory to glory. Nor was he mistaken in believing that a character such as that of Jesus, a ministry and sacrifice like His, with the revelation it brings of human values and of divine forces, and with the powers that go forth from it for the re-creation of human life, constitute the best assurance we have or can have of the immortal life. In His life the reality of the world of the spirit is so evidently seen as to be above denial. Immortality belongs

to the things that are in their nature eternal, to God, to truth, to duty, to goodness; and the only immorality which has worth and is to be desired is that which is attested by the reality of these things and attained by living in fellowship and agreement with them. Paul knows this world of the spirit, its supreme excellence and beauty, its joy and its power. He has seen it in the face of Jesus Christ, and is convinced because of Him that it is destined to prevail, and that it is the safe and abiding dwelling-place of all who choose to make it their home.

Paul's hope for life after death rests then ultimately upon his present dying and living with Christ; that is, upon his present experience of the spirit of Christ remaking his nature after its own likeness. We may not understand best what this meant by the more mystical expressions of it (Gal. 2:20; 2 Cor. 3:17-18; Rom. 6:2-11; 8:9-11), characteristic though these are of Paul's mind. The real contents of this view of life, which Paul knows to be divine and therefore undying, can be understood best by his description of his own character, purposes, and conduct given, in defense of his ministry, not in boasting or self-interest, in 1 Thessalonians 2: 1-12, and especially in 2 Corinthians 10-13; and in his account of the fruit of the spirit, "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance" (Gal. 5:22-23; comp. Col. 3:12-14; Rom. 12); and in his judgments as to the relative value of those gifts of the spirit which were to early Christianity evidences of God's indwelling in man, and so of man's sharing in the immortal nature; Paul subjects them all to the test of Christ-likeness, and makes love therefore the test of the value and reality of the rest, and the greatest of the three that are destined to abide (1 Cor. 12-14).

According to Paul's experience the spirit which creates these divine effects in human lives and is the present evidence and possession of eternal life is not the divine part of human nature as such, but has come into human



life through an historical event, the life, death and resurrection of an historical person. This Spirit of God is the spirit of Christ; it is Christ Himself as He takes possession of men and becomes their life, their new self; and the nature of this spirit is Divine Love. Man shares this divine nature only by the gift of the love of God; so that life beyond death is assured and created in man by the eternal love of God manifested and given to us in Christ. Nothing—not death itself—can separate us from the love of Christ, the love of God which is in Christ. This is the ultimate ground of Paul's confidence. But love can be given only as love; it can be received only by those who love. The work of love is to create lovers, says Royce. If the divine love is the source and power and nature of man's eternal life then the conditions and purpose and goal of that life must be interpreted in accordance with the nature of love, the mind of Christ. This is Paul's guiding principle throughout. The future life can be hoped for only as it is now practiced and attained by likeness to Christ. This oneness of Christians with Christ which is both Christ's effect in them and their following of Him, is described and urged too clearly and constantly by Paul to leave any doubt that he means by it the actual character of the actual Jesus. Likeness to Christ is not a law which if one obey he will receive life after death as his reward. It is already that life; and one possesses it only by dying and living with Christ, dying now to sin, and rising to newness of life.

But love cannot be a thing given by one and received by another. It is received only when it is given back, or given forth. Mutuality and co-operation are involved in the very nature of love. There is a loss of self in love which is nevertheless the finding of gaining of self. Paul's answer to our most pressing question, that which concerns the permanence of personality, would be, we may be sure, determined, as all else is, by the nature of love. Since love is a relationship between persons, Paul clings,

as we have seen, to that "spiritual body," both for Christ and for all who are Christ's which meant to him the continuance of distinction and individuality. Yet Paul knows that it is not according to love, or according to Christ, to seek one's own, either for this life or for the life to come. When Christ lives in him, the "I" no longer lives (Gal. 2:20.) Love destroys the self in every sense in which it involves selfish assertion and separateness. Oneness, not division, is the creation of love. For those who have put on Christ "there can be neither Jew nor Greek . . . bond nor free . . . male nor female; for ye are all one (man) in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28). The immortality that is according to love would seem to require both the saving and the loss of individuality, its saving in and through its loss. He that would find his life shall lose it, and he that loses his life shall save it. That Paul understands this paradox is evident (2 Cor. 4:7-18; 6:3-10); but perhaps nowhere more strikingly shown than in what he says of the final purpose of the risen life of Christ Himself. "All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; but ye, Christ's; but Christ, God's" (1 Cor. 3:21-23). Christ rises to Lordship, and must reign, till He has put all His enemies under His feet, death last of all; but "when all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. 15:20-28).

The final place of individual personalities will be that which is determined by the nature of love, the nature of God. Paul's doctrine of immortality is not a doctrine of self-assertion or self-centered desire. Christ means to him the opposite of this. "Ye are not your own." "He died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves." "For none of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's."

## WHAT MADE THE CAPTAIN'S FAITH SO GREAT?

BY A. L. VAIL.

The Lord had been active in His ministry for comparatively a long time when He met the centurion whose faith greatly pleased Him. So was He impressed by it that He spoke of it in an extraordinary way. He said that He had not found so great faith in Israel, that the faith of this Roman officer was greater than He had met among His own people. This was after He had appointed apostles, spoken many great things, and wrought many wonders of various kinds. The significance in this event arose not from the healing in itself, but from the faith of the man for whom it had been done. But when we look for the explanation of the Lord's appreciation of this faith we fail to find it in what the Scripture says about it. We are induced to think that something has been omitted from the story, which something is the thing which supports and explains the encomium spoken by Jesus. So we find for ourselves a problem just here, making it necessary to search for explanation in order to understand the meaning of the applauded faith. Can we find anything to clear the cloud on our understanding?

If we are to discover the meaning not expressed in the record, it seems to me to lie under the surface of Matthew 8:9 and Luke 7:8: "For I am a man set under authority, having under me soldiers" who obey my orders. This word "for " indicates an explanation of the great faith, but it is followed by the speaker's statement that he himself is under authority. But what has his being *under* authority to do with it, provided only that his subordinates obey his orders? The text as it stands involves a palpable *non sequitur*. It assumes something to follow which does not follow. If he had said, "For I am in authority, not under it, and my soldiers obey me", the connection would be consistent. It would mean the captain's recognition

of the Healer's control of disease as the officer had control of his soldiers; and therefore in the Healer's relation to the disease, as in the officer's relation to his men, all that was necessary was to issue the order. But he did not say that. He said not that he was in authority, superior to his soldiers, but under it, himself a subordinate; and then he proceeded to say that which would naturally have followed the preceding if it had been just the opposite from what it was! How can this incongruity in the connection be removed?

A suggestion may help us if we give it due weight. The account as it stands until the Lord's expression of His estimate of the faith, does not impress us so much with the greatness of the faith, or anything else, as it impresses us with the courtesy, the modesty, the humility of the men's protest against the Healer's giving him the honor which He seemed about to give by entering his house. This is the conspicuous thing on the surface, but Jesus seems to have no appreciation of it, gives it no attention at all; which is the more impressive because this modest and humble gentleman was a military officer of Rome, one of a class whose duty and training were all in the direction of pride and self-assertion. Now, with our perplexity reinforced by this suggestion, let us return to our question, What was it in the centurian's faith that so impressed the Lord with its greatness?

Nothing new was in the healing itself, for such work had been done by Jesus previously, and presumably many times. One conspicuous example at least seems to have been earlier, as recorded in three Gospels, that of the healing and pardon of the man let down through the roof, the fame of which ran far and almost certainly reached this officer, for it was in Capernaum where he lived. In that instance the four who bore the invalid showed great faith, which moved the Lord toward response, and the crowning favor for that paralytic, the forgiveness of his sin, must have been in response to his own perhaps un-



spoken faith and penitence, which Jesus recognized without dependence on his dumb tongue. (The four were not thinking of pardon, but healing, the man was thinking of his sin, his tongue perhaps was paralyzed, but Jesus saw his thought and answered it, in the order in which he saw it, pardon first and healing second.)

Was anything new or superior in the faith that Jesus could or would heal without the presence of the invalid? According to a commonly accepted harmony, such work had been done in the healing of the nobleman's son, which was not only earlier but also in Capernaum, and was done for a man who was urging the Healer to hasten to his house, quite evidently because he had no idea that the healing could be accomplished at a distance. So the faith in absent treatment indicates no superiority in it.

Was anything in this officer's knowledge of Jesus otherwise, or his religious standing and maturity, indicating greater faith? Nothing seems to appear. On the contrary, that he had built a synagogue indicates his special intimacy with Jewish religion. His friends, who first presented his need to the Lord, said that he not only had provided the synagogue but that he loved their nation. His expenditure for the accommodation of their religion seems to have been promoted by his love for the Jews themselves. That this love expressed itself in a provision for their religion suggests that he loved their religion; otherwise he would presumably have provided some other kind of building. It seems easy to believe that he was a proselyte, substantially if not formally, to the religion which he thus favored. This might have been secretly because of his connection with the Roman army. And the more Jewish we understand him to have been, the more are we led to think of him as advanced in knowledge of Jesus and faith in Him, such as would have deprived his faith in this incident of any distinctive element on the basis of which the Lord could have proclaimed it as "greater".

Now what remains conceivable as a basis for the Master's estimate of this man's faith in this affair as being greater than that of any Jew in relation to any of the many works which had been done in all of His gracious manifestations to Israel? This question seems to me to bring us to the brink of a precipice where we must halt in confusion or plunge into an abyss of unreason or bridge the chasm by finding something more in his faith than we have so far found, and this is our quest. Jesus said this extraordinary thing out of His ample knowledge and superior insight. He "knew what was in man", and He knew what was in this man; and if we could see under the surface here as He saw, the presumption is reasonable that we would see what lies there, unexpressed in the text but open to the Lord's eye, which justifies this otherwise perplexing statement.

Consider another step specifically. In what aspect of faith was Jesus speaking here? He repeatedly affirmed and often emphasized the importance, the necessity, of faith considered practically, in relation to securing results of various kinds: sometimes positively when successful and other times negatively when unsuccessful. But here and now faith is considered comparatively, the comparison being between smaller and greater. Such comparative instances elsewhere in the Gospels always compare between two states in the same individual or group. This appears to be the only such comparison in the Gospels between two distinctly differing classes; one Gentile, Roman, military officer; the other the whole Jewish nation in all the ranks of its people flocking to Jesus from all directions.

As we contemplate this man he grows upon us. He is not a blind beggar by the wayside. His precise courtesy, his unadorned modesty, his unfeigned humility, predispose us to think of him as a person superior in character as Jesus understood character, resting on substantial intelligence and spiritual superiority; as one who be-

neath his military uniform carried the intellect of a philosopher and the spirit of a saint. Let us not unrein our optimistic imagination here, of course, neither let us trample on it. We are invited, if not commanded, to recognize in him one who thought beneath and above the common currents of religious thinking in his time and environment, whether in Hebrew peasant or Roman commander; one to whom God had spoken beneath the trappings of his employment and the sight of his associates. Did not Jesus, looking into the depths of him, see with what thought he filled the hiatus in the story, and answer that in him when He spoke of his faith? If this is in the direction of a discreet interpretation, what was that conception which had been attained by this modest, courteous and humble man? Keeping in mind our exclusion of greatness in effects, let us look for greatness in character, in philosophy of life or understanding of the great Teacher himself.

Insert the probe beneath the surface in this way: Immediately after the clause, "For I am a man placed under authority", insert these words, "To which authority I am obedient": and then continue, "having soldiers under me", &c. This is to say that the unrecorded thought of the speaker, which was the source of his current remarks, was that his control of his subordinates depended on his own obedience to his superiors. (Whether his unrecorded thought was also not expressed at that time is immaterial.) Next, let us expand this suggestion in a paraphrase, completing the captain's statement as we assume that Jesus saw it in his mind, and as it stands in our addition to the text, in this way: "Do not trouble yourself to come into my house. I am not worthy and it is not necessary. I think of your authority as it is illustrated by my own. I am under authority, placed subordinate to my superiors and supreme over my inferiors in rank. I see myself as a link in a chain of authorities. If my link fails the chain is broken. I keep my mastery

downward by keeping my loyalty upward. If I disobey the command of my superior, my inferiors are thereby released from their obedience to me. As long as my connections upward are intact my authority downward is such that I do not need to carry my command in person but it is perfectly effective when I send it from anywhere that I may be. So I see You, a mighty prophet of God endowed with authority over all diseases, being empowered from above for the control of them, because You are true to Him who sent You. Your teachings, your works, your character of purity in yourself and graciousness toward the lowly, unite to certify You to this high relationship. Therefore You do not need to go to any place, do not need to speak any audible words. You can heal my servant by Your unspoken command shot silently through the air. Will it, and Your will works it, because the will of God it is Your will to do''.

If Jesus saw some such thinking in the captain's mind, as the ground of his confidence in the result through the simplest and swiftest and easiest process, would not that philosophy underlying the faith make it greater than any other that had been utilized and appreciated and applauded by the Lord? Other faiths had been apparently as great on other grounds, but all of them had had only the same comparatively shallow grounds; but here now is faith rooting in deeper grounds and rising to higher realms; the depths and heights of a philosophy of the divine operation and the loftier meanings of the magnificent Healer himself.

Every faith has its underlying philosophy, or theology, which sustains it and labels it with the stamp of its grade, its greatness. The ordinary observer, or exerciser, of the faith may not see its philosophy or theology, but the extraordinary observer or exerciser may see it, and his sight will automatically enlarge and exalt his understanding and appreciation of the faith itself. So then, if the Lord here for the first time met an applicant for



His healing aid who had attained to that conception of His personality and relations upward, which Jesus Himself already had, in that conception may be fairly found the Lord's meaning when He said, "I have not found so great faith in Israel". (This conception of these relationships in this application of it, does not appear to have been previously announced even by Jesus Himself.)

Moreover, notice how Matthew inserts into the body of his report of this incident a few words of the Lord which show that His own thought was then set to a larger view, harmoniously with the centurion's larger view though surpassing it. This larger view of the Master is recorded in immediate connection with His announcement of the greater faith. This announcement was addressed not to the captain, nor privately to apostles or disciples; but the Lord "turned" in order that the announcement might be heard by the "multitude that followed Him", to whom it was addressed. The way that it comes into the record seems to me to indicate a special relation between what Jesus saw in the man's mind and what was in His own mind as He contemplated the higher meanings and greater conquests of His message in the world. What is it? "I say to you that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven; but the sons of the kingdom (of Israel) shall be cast forth into the outer darkness". This Roman officer almost certainly had no idea of the deity of Jesus as we understand it. He saw in Him only a great prophet of the God of Israel, from Whom He had received extraordinary powers, being endowed exceptionally in consequence of His firm and fine loyalty to God, based in His exalted fellowship with God, as the centurion had come to believe in God. On that basis his superior mind had reasoned along the way between cause and consequence toward the higher conception and the broader application of the same kind of cause and consequence which was in the mind of Jesus. So these

two were joined and the thought of the one was caught up by the Other as He exclaimed, "I have not found so great faith, not even in Israel"! Consider also in this connection that this seems to have been the first time that our Lord ever expressed to men His own expectation of the extension of His Kingdom to take in people of all races. He had a few times appeared to hint it, had said what might suggest it to those competent to understand, if any such were present, but never before had He spoken it out in full as He did now, and to an unlimited audience as if He was moved by an enthusiastic optimism in the contemplation of His greater vision of something that had some connection with this man's greater faith. If the conclusion to which this study has now come is accepted, it enhances in a significant way our understanding of these two men.

First and chiefly, it suggests something worth while concerning the development of the Lord's understanding of His mission to earth. Possibly it was what might be termed a climatic resting place of it. To get more precisely, if not more clearly, my meaning in this term, it is necessary to push the prospect a stage further. The next item in the record, and which appears only in Luke's Gospel, is the restoration to life of the youth at Nain. That event exhibits points of progress in the Saviour's benefactions in several ways. It was the first raising of the dead on record in the Gospels, perhaps the first service that was not asked by any one, perhaps the first in connection with which no human faith was required or furnished, and no expectation of the blessing by the recipients of it. Observe these points and meditate on them. Combined they indicate a topmost output of wonderful grace with no condition or source except the "compassion" of the Helper. In the usually recognized chronological order these two, the "so great faith" and the Lord's greatest control over the forces of life and death, stand in recognized conjunction, with nothing whatever between them. Recall not only that Luke alone tells this

restoration story, but also that he alone pledges himself at the beginning of his Gospel to set the things, of which others had written, in their order. Whatever other kind of order may have been in his mind when he wrote that pledge, the first natural understanding is that he meant the chronological order. Now, having reached this point as we have, the conclusion does not seem chimerical that a close relation exists between what Jesus saw in the centurion's mind and what He did at Nain as a revelation of His own mind. (The reminder may not be amiss that the word "marveled", as expressing the effect of the captain's faith, means in the original and in various applications generally, "admired", and is so rendered in some translations at this point. Jesus admired the faith that He pronounced "so great".) Out of all this arises the reverent interpretation of Jesus as He approached Nain as being in a new, or at least in a refreshed and strengthened purpose to work on the basis of His compassion alone, or conspicuously, a work at the apex of controlling power; in a field in which Elijah and Elisha had been the only workers among the mighty ancients, and surpassing them in the one motive mentioned, compassion. Those two forerunners in this field had wrought in response to favors shown them by their beneficiaries, and in response to their appeals; but Jesus now lifts the whole manifestation of helpfulness to a higher plane and a finer function.

Second, contingent on the foregoing and concurrently with it, the centurion rises into significance. He is disclosed more and more clearly and impressively as a captain, not only in the army of Rome but also in the army of believers in Jesus. Does he not in some sense and some degree appear as the forerunner of that other Gentile, of the same military rank and similar spiritual character, whom Peter met at Caesarea as his Lord had met this one at Capernaum? What the Lord here said to the multitude, concerning the ultimate sweep of His gospel on earth, links itself in its total substance with what Peter learned and what God did through Peter and Cornelius.

## THE CHURCH'S CHOICE.

S. ANGUS, M. A., PH. D., PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT  
AND HISTORICAL THEOLOGY, ST. ANDREW'S COLLEGE,  
SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA.

(Continued from April Number.)

To meet the present emergency advice is being offered the Church from every quarter. (1) Some point a short-cut to success by way of a *business-like organization*, as if the service of the altar and the pathology of souls were synonymous with the management of a business concern. Dr. Jowett, in his sermon in Durham Cathedral, characterized such advice as that of the world as against Christ's advice to "agonize". In this era of re-construction "organize" is a popular word, and like most popular cries has some contact with truth. The Church has been organizing through the war and since the armistice; yet the pews remain empty. If there is anything certain from the lessons of history, it is that no reorganization can rescue or perpetuate a moribund Church. If the Church is moribund reorganization has come too late: if the Church is still palpitating with the life of its divine Lord, it will reorganize itself to meet every emergency of a new age. A living organism automatically adapts itself to new environment, discovering prophylactics against forces threatening its disintegration, and assimilating such elements as render its life more true to principle in every change. If machinery, or "plant", can make an efficient Church, the Church to-day should be more efficient than ever. It has appropriated business methods, possesses enormous endowments, has organized its corporate life with an amazing degree of perfection. It has called into its service the best art, employs the best music, and is increasingly adopting every new psychological and paedeutic method in its Sunday-schools. Yet, according



to many, the pulpit to-day has waned as a spiritual power. Reorganization cannot engender life in the Church: it can be merely the result of life inherent in the Church. Church history warns us that the best periods of the Church's work have not coincided with those of its best outward organization. The war has demonstrated afresh that morale counts for more than equipment, necessary as the latter is. The Church of Christ needs not ecclesiasts but prophets. President J. A. Kelso referred in his baccalaureate address this year in Pittsburgh to a conversation he had had with one of the leading Church historians of America who said: "In the course of the first four centuries Christianity had been Hellenized; in the middle ages it had been paganized; in our day it was being commercialized".

(2) Advice from a neighboring quarter is *Modernize*. Let the Church recognize the change in religious fashions, let it adjust itself to the *Zeitgeist*, let it move with the times. Let the Church modify the harshness of its demands to meet the weakness of humanity. Brighten the services. Shorten the sermons, or, better still, eliminate the pulpit in favor of the choir; otherwise, let the pulpit derive its themes not from the love of God in Christ and the soul's immortalities, but from popular topics. Let its invectives be directed against the profiteer and the capitalist, and its blessing fall upon the ideals of the proletariat. Let the Church court popularity—the sure way to success. Again, let the Church scrap its antiquated creeds, unintelligible now to the unlettered, distasteful to the educated.

There is much wisdom in this command to modernize. But here again, the counsellors begin at the wrong end. A living Church modernizes itself automatically. A Church which considers itself not only in possession of a given revelation, but in search for the plenitude of truth will be a modern Church. A Church, whose heart is open and receptive to every prompting and operation of the

Spirit, will not let slip a single truth, and, moreover, will not require to be first advised of it by the world. But how modernize? Adopt the spirit of the age? But that spirit might be an evil spirit. Move with the times? But the times might be moving in the wrong direction. It cannot mean by concession to materialism to lower the Christian standard of life's values. That would spell death to the Church whose duty is to assert the fundamental spirituality of human life. It cannot lie in congratulating ourselves on the superiority of our age, for the cry from the Cross in "Onward". The Church must continue its protest against things as they are with a view to things as they ought to be. The Church, therefore, must march ahead of the times. In its origin it was prophetic, and prophetic it must remain. It must inspire the age with the spirit of Christ rather than receive its inspiration from the age. It ought not in intellectual inertia await the world's announcement of truth and progress, but ought rather to be the creative and stimulating factor in men's thinking on the problems of the universe. In this modern practical age the Church must be practical. But how? save by indefatigably pointing men to the source of all reality and truth, by re-affirming the eternal values, and by emphatically declaring that man doth not live by bread alone. The Church must say to this age as Augustine did to his: "Seek what ye seek, but not where you seek". Surely in this task the Church of Christ is the most pragmatic institution in the world. Christianity is spiritual pragmatism: it "works".

The Church must keep abreast of the highest ethical and spiritual aspirations of the age. If the theological outlook of the Church and that of Christian thinkers are disparate, thoughtful men will not maintain allegiance to the Church, which must concede to the twentieth century the same divine right of thinking as to the first or the fifth or the sixteenth. The Church has never lived by dogmas, which are precipitated doctrines, but by faith which is

ever creative and continuously seeking new expression for its widening experience. The Creeds may not be obsolete, but there are constituent declarations in them calling for revision and restatement. The whole subject of religious authority must be carefully reconsidered: in reopening this question the Church must not be forced merely to choose among Schleiermacher's subjectivism, Newman's objectivism, and Ritschl's historic positivism. Christian experience must be given the right of way over Tradition: the present and the future must weigh in the scales of an impartial judgment as at least of equal worth with the past. Intuition and Reason, the voices from the past and the living experiences of the present, must be duly valued. The methods and freedom employed in other sciences may be profitably employed in theology. Truth attained in the pursuit of truth for its own sake is transmuted in the moral life into spiritual energy. The teachers of the Church must cease to have recourse to the subterfuge of ambiguity of language to conceal theological ignorance; they must not cloak feebleness of argument under a pious phraseology, or cite dogmas from the past to lay the spirit of enquiry. Such procedure will fail to commend religion. Prof. Kirsopp Lake has asserted that "theological statement will before long be accepted exactly so far as it is based on evidence, just as is the case with any other science, otherwise it will be regarded as superstition. Moreover, it will make no claim to special sources of knowledge once revealed and now hidden, for whereas theological systems of the past were based on a triumphant but unfounded belief in supernatural knowledge, the systems of to-morrow will be bounded, like those of other sciences, by the securer though humbler recognition of natural ignorance".<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Stewardship of Faith*, p. 167 f. Cf. *ibid*, p. 169: "What men feel is that if the Church is a society for the maintenance of a close and defined system of theology it has no message for them, and has as little claim to be taken seriously as a society of chemists would should it take for its purpose, not the discovery and propagation of chemical truth, but the preservation of the scientific theories of the middle ages."

The Church's bounden duty is to restate Christianity in such a way as to make it intelligible and convincing to men of the twentieth century without losing one fragment of its truth. It must take into account the immense strides made by the several sciences in the last two generations. People of to-day do not look to the Church merely to repeat historic formulæ or to expound the Nicene creed, but to declare without apheresis the whole counsel of God, his boundless love in Christ, and his plan for the universe.

(3) Another panacea for the ills of the present and prophylactic against perils of the future is Church Union. Let the Church, it is said, present a united front to the world. Let denominational, creedal, and sacerdotal distinctions be erased. Let the Church become, what she is reputed once to have been, Catholic. If the Church were one and spoke with one voice her power in the community would be multiplied, socially, educationally, and spiritually. The State would be obliged to give heed to her moral protests and to assist in realizing her ideals.

But neither the Churches nor individual Christians are agreed as to the nature of the "Union". Is it to be organic union, corporate and external, or unity of spirit in one Lord? Is it to be effected by amalgamation of existing churches or by federation? Before the war this question was engaging the mind of the Church; meanwhile the question has become more acute. So far the main progress has been made everywhere along the lines of co-operation or federation; there has been a growing consciousness of the essential spirit of unity which admits of diversities of creed and polity. The Churches in England and the United States have adopted the method of federation or are moving in that direction.<sup>2</sup> In New Zea-

---

<sup>2</sup> In dealing with "Union" we are not referring to the inevitable coalescence of Churches holding the same polity and creed, such as in recent movements among some of the Presbyterian Churches of America, or the impending re-union of the United Free and Established Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, or the drawing together of the Methodist Churches in England.



land a few months ago the Congregational Church amalgamated with the Presbyterian. In Canada and Australia the Methodist, Congregational and Presbyterian Churches have for some years been striving to secure corporate union, but in both countries a strong opposition has developed which is likely to render organic union at present impossible. In view of such opposition, consisting of about 40 per cent of communicants and adherents, in the Presbyterian Church of Australia, the last General Assembly meeting in Sydney in September 1920, refused to "accept this vote as a mandate from the Church to proceed to further negotiations with the other Churches concerned on such matters as are still necessary", and likewise refused to "enjoin the committee to take such steps as may be advisable to keep the question of union before our people", finally deciding in favor of "encouraging inter-Church relationships" by co-operation.

So far as the writer can judge, Church "Union" cannot be the means to the rectification of the disorders of the present. In the first place, it will come too late to set right contemporary evils. Even allowing for the acceleration of popular movements by the war, organic or corporate union is not likely to be effected within this generation. There are some unionist optimists who believe otherwise. But the growth and persistence of determined opposition by considerable minorities against amalgamation reveals the danger of "Union" proving but the cause of the rise of another Church among existing Churches, and thus aggravating what are to unionists "our present unhappy divisions". The Churches, though not anchored to the past, have each a past of spiritual vigor and inspiring tradition which shapes their present outlook and qualifies them in a large measure for the tasks of the present. Institutions cannot easily allow a cherished past to slip off them like a loose garment. Unless the Churches believe that they have failed during that past, or are convinced that their "schism" was originally "sin" or has

become "sin", or that their functions can nowadays be more efficiently performed by fusion than by immediate and practicable federation, they will not look favorably on reabsorption or amalgamation. Organic union and uniformity even among a small group of the Churches of Christendom are too nebulous and too distant to cure the clamant ills of to-day.

In the next place, it may be questioned whether organic union is the one consummation devoutly to be wished, or whether what we need most to-day is not the immediate recognition of the underlying spiritual unity in one Lord amid all varieties of ritual and polity. Co-operative union is realizable amid diversities of temperament and tradition, while organic union is fraught with serious difficulties, and would require contracting parties to surrender much that is both dear and valuable. Co-operative union has already been put in practice and can be immediately extended in scope to embrace a large portion of Christendom, while organic union is possible, and is being attempted only among a small group of Churches.

What can Church Union accomplish in the future that co-operation cannot set in operation now? Will the immediate results of a numerous co-operative alliance not outweigh the results likely to accrue from the organic union of a small group of churches in a more or less distant future? President W. D. Mackenzie, in an able article "If the Church were one", enumerates<sup>3</sup> what the Church "could be and what it could do for the whole of mankind, if . . . it could stand forth once more as a united Church" as follows: (1) it would discover and cause the world to behold catholicity of doctrine which would give it universal authority. (2) "Vigor, freedom and power" in the propagation of Christianity. (3) The Church "would fearlessly hold up before the eyes of men everywhere the same supreme moral standards" for the personal, business, and domestic life. (4) In education

---

<sup>3</sup> *Constructive Quarterly*, Sep. 1919.

"the united Church would have a power in the world which it has never yet secured, without which its true work for humanity can never be accomplished". (5) In regard to citizenship "it shall cleanse public life at its fountain heads". (6) In industrial and social reformation "it could and would amass a range of knowledge in every part of the earth, and then exercise a supreme moral authority combined with rare wisdom which would make it a true guide of the history of man".

These are blessings for which we are all laboring. But we shall have to wait for them long if they are to be obtained only by the Church being "one" in an organic union. These may all accrue to mankind *forthwith* by the re-awakening within the Church of its fundamental unity. We need not wait to reconcile Presbytery with independency, or the Presbyterian "call" with the Methodist circuit appointments, or the baptismal doctrines of some of the reformed churches with those of the several Baptist Churches, or the Anglican episcopate with papal episcopacy. These may one day be harmonized as the Churches minimize their differentia and magnify their common faith. Meanwhile, if the Churches are inspired by the one Spirit of the all-conquering Christ they may be more truly, because spiritually, "one" and express in their work and mutual recognition more perfectly their "unity" than if conjoined in a formal union. Each Church may as effectively operate and co-operate for the Kingdom of God as families do for the State.

Those who, impressed by the necessity of an immediate alliance of the Churches in order to cope with materialism, advocate federal unity rather than amalgamation, do not pretend to prophecy that a deepening unity of spirit may not one day issue in a more visible and organic union, but do affirm that to such union, if ever accomplished, co-operation is the requisite preparation. The way to organic union must inevitably be slow, and it is impossible to predict whether a living organism, like the

Church, will ultimately re-absorb all the organisms which in its evolution it has cast off. Time alone will decide. If ever union shall be born of unity federalist Christians will not withstand the ways of God. Those who call upon the name of the Lord Jesus are everywhere becoming increasingly conscious of their religious brotherhood. The Church must not be behind the age in its more liberal and human outlook. Disunion, exclusiveness, ecclesiastical pride, contentions over boundary lines, will impair the work of the Church. Spiritual unity is an imperative duty, a necessary means of self-preservation of the Church in the fulfillment of its mission. This unity is already in process of realization. Such unity must be so deep as to silence all antagonisms, so sincere as to prevent sectarian exclusivism, so rich as to embrace all varieties of experience. The Churches must enlarge their charity and manifest their sanity in discriminating between the essential and the accessory.

(4) Another advice offered to the Church is: Back to Christ, Back to Apostolic Christianity, Back to the golden age of prophets and martyrs. Let the past be taken as normative for the present. If by this is intended that Christ is the perennial source of power for all who acknowledge His Lordship, that His spirit has been the un-failing dynamic of man's history, that our religion is an historic religion based upon the Person of Christ, with a continuity of experience stretching through the centuries—the advice thus far is correct. But if it means that Christianity is a static quantity, that the Church's golden age lies behind rather than before, that God is not as truly revealing His will to the hearts of men now as of old, one must dissent. The Church in action in the twentieth century is not necessarily a replica of the Church in the first. The creative days of our Christian faith are not to be found only in the past. That faith in its ever expanding life is putting forth fresh creative energies and calling into action new forces. It must continue to make fresh



departures and enter upon untrodden ways. It must claim for Christ and baptize into His name every onward movement, every new truth, every worthy aspiration. The Church is witness to a Christianity which is not a fossil in the strata of history, but a living religion changing with the process of man's spiritual experience, always maintaining its identity through all permutations. It is, and always has been, movement and life. Its business in this changing world is not merely to maintain its fixed position but to lengthen its cords and strengthen its stakes. Its greatest glories shine in the future; its duty is to be faithful to that future. Herein is our hope for the Church. It is witnessing for a Christ who inspires every age, who is not only the Alpha but the Omega, who is before us as behind us. The Church is not called upon to accommodate the present to the past, but to shape the present for the sake of the greater future.

There is ample evidence that the Church is not asleep in her task of Christianizing modern society. Some characteristic utterances of Christian thinkers may be cited which are instructive both in their agreements and their differences.

Prof. D. S. Cairns, in "Christ and the World at War", says that if we are "to find a God great enough to dominate the circumstances and us who live in them" four things are necessary: 1. A missionary Christianity "controlled by the ideal of winning the whole world for Christ"; 2. That "Christ shall have dominion over our whole international life": 3. "We have to seek to make him King throughout all the sphere of social life".

The Church must re-awaken for spiritual ends that ideal of self-sacrifice which the war called forth. Prof. Kirkpatrick, of Toronto,<sup>4</sup> enumerates the notes which must belong to the Church of the future as "spiritual-mindedness, the evangelical note, the note of sacrifice, constructive aim, the unity of the Spirit."

---

<sup>4</sup> *Constructive Quarterly*, Sep. 1919, p. 432.

Prof. Mercer, of Chicago, maintains that two courses are open to the Church in the future: "She must become a regularly recognized institution of the State, with authority to teach morals and social science as well as religion, or she must be relieved of all responsibility in moral and social affairs—as much the sphere and concern of the State as public health and education are—and thus be at liberty to teach and to exemplify the divine art of praise and worship, as well as to be, as she always has been, the inspirer of all good and noble works and deeds, the source of all spiritual life, the fountain of all holiness".<sup>5</sup> President McGiffert, of New York, wrote a few years ago in the *Hibert Journal* "The watchword of the modern Christian, if he believes in the permanent leadership of Christ should be not 'Back to Christ', but 'Forward with Christ.' . . . The great business of Christianity is to give men faith—not faith in the past, but in the future—to strengthen their confidence, to steady their purposes, to increase their courage, as they look and labor for better things to come." Prof. Lake summarizes the three problems facing organized Christianity under the heads of theology, the ministry, and ethics, thus: 1. "What the Churches are asked to produce is not a restatement of traditional theology but a restatement of religion in modern languages"; 2. In regard to the ministry Christianity must fulfill two requirements, first, reform the education of ministers "so that candidates for the ministry shall be trained primarily in the facts of spiritual life, in health and in sickness, and only secondarily in the history of the religious life of the past"; secondly, Christianity being no longer a Church but a collection of Churches, and the question of "orders" arising, "the task of the future is not reunion, but recognition and co-operation"; 3. The disquieting disorders of the present demand "the establishment of some superior of nations"

---

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 472-5.

and "a new extension of Christian ethic to raise the standard of social and national life."<sup>6</sup>

The Rt. Rev. John Edwards, present moderator of the Presbyterian Church in New South Wales, contends in his "Theological Reconstruction"<sup>7</sup> that if the Church is not to be left a derelict on the sands of time it must re-state its message, conserving all that is of permanent worth from the past while appropriating the results of the highest thought of the present. He lays down three principles of re-construction: (1) Freedom, or truth for truth's sake; (2) An obvious corollary—"the withdrawal of the ordinary conception of authority in religion in favor of the only tenable conception of a final authority—i. e., the conception of the internal authority of the truth itself"; (3) "Such a conception of God and Man and the World as will forever banish the dualism" bequeathed by eighteenth century Deism.

A hesitating Church, uncertain as to what course to pursue, a Church tempted to court popularity, will never be a triumphant Church. The Church must heroically and at whatever cost of membership or endowments obey God rather than man. The world must not secularize the Church. The Church must refuse to dissipate its energies and must restrict itself to its high calling of stimulating the spiritual life. It is not the function of the Church to organize or conduct society, but to inspire it with Christian ideals. It is unnecessary for the Church to return to the political arena or to enter the economic. It is not a judge or divider in questions of wages. But it must be familiar with the economic, social, and international problems, and with the motives and ideals underlying them; that is, it must understand the psychology and pathology of the soul in every age. Such acquaintance with the psychology of the Trades Hall, the factory, the office, the homes of culture, the universities, will enable

<sup>6</sup> *The Stewardship of Faith*, pp. 163-180.

<sup>7</sup> Angus and Robertson, Ltd., Sydney, 1921.

the Church to find points of contact for the gospel. Addressing a Church conference some months ago, Mr. Lloyd George wisely said that the duty of the Churches is to create the atmosphere in which social reforms are possible. If the Church stands forth for a true brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God it will thereby solve the social and economic problems of the time. If it once convinces men of the reality of the unseen, of the life hid with Christ in God as the plenitude of life, the profiteer will disappear, and labor will not only receive but give a fair return. So far as the Church succeeds in asserting the primacy of the spiritual, in that measure society will be remade.

The Church has no reason to be fearful. An all-conquering Faith in the divine Love must be kept burning bright in its shrines and in the hearts of its members. The Church must summon the followers of Jesus to fresh consecration. It must not merely continue to protest against the world as it is, but must imbue society with the spirit of sacrifice and that glad obedience to the will of God which overcomes the world. It must cry aloud in ears deafened by the tumultuous disorders of the present that no civilization however splendid, no patriotism however lofty, no legislation however socialistic, can abide, or save the world, apart from religion. During the Cambridge University Mission, Dr. A. H. Gray, of Glasgow, reiterated in a striking address that Jesus alone can save civilization.

The Church must adhere to the boundless optimism of Jesus, maintaining an abiding conviction that its message of the love of God in Christ can never be antiquated, that the resources of spiritual power on which it draws are inexhaustible. It must remain steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that its labor has not been and shall not be in vain. The gates of hell shall not prevail against it, for, in Samuel Rutherford's quaint phrase, "the devil is



but God's master-fencer to teach us to handle our weapons." Grippled by the conviction that the imperious cravings of man's spiritual nature can from generation to generation be satisfied by Christ it will not fail to magnify its Lord. Having read the lessons of the past, and being persuaded that God's purposes are sure and that his word shall not return unto him void, the Church will courageously face the immense tasks of to-day. "For God gave us not a spirit of fearfulness, but of power and love and discipline".

"Blazoned as on heaven's immortal noon,  
The Cross leads generation on".

# PREREQUISITES TO AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE SYSTEM OF THEOLOGY OF AUGUSTUS HOPKINS STRONG.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN W. JOHNSON, PROFESSOR OF  
SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

There are, we think, three prerequisites to an appreciative understanding of Dr. Strong's "Systematic Theology" without which the modern student will almost inevitably find in it certain intractable problems.

The first of these prerequisites is a historical perspective of the world, in which Dr. Strong's mind came to maturity and which created for him his task as an interpreter of Protestant Evangelical Theology.

The second prerequisite lies in an effort to understand the philosophical attitude of Dr. Strong's thought to his intellectual environment.

The third prerequisite is the recognition of the religious attitude of Dr. Strong as articulated in his progressive evangelical theology.

## FIRST PREREQUISITE.

The first prerequisite necessitates a true historical perspective. Such a perspective of the world of Dr. Strong's developing manhood reveals a period of rapidly changing conditions in the industrial world, new franchises and fresh enslavements in the political world, a quickened religious life in Protestantism, largely due to the influence of Wesleyan Methodism, but itself breaking up into many branches; the abolition of slavery in all the British Dominions at the cash price of 20,000,000 pounds Sterling and largely the result of the life-labors of William Wilberforce; the rise of the Movement for the Abolition of Slavery in America in-

spired by such men as William Lloyd Garrison, Lovejoy, Wendell Philips and Whittier.

Born during the Presidency of Andrew Jackson and one year before the Coronation of Queen Victoria, he grew up in the days of great men and world-transforming changes. The Atlantic Cable was laid in the year 1857, the same year in which Dr. Strong graduated from Yale College. While he was a student in the Rochester Theological Seminary, the Lincoln-Douglas debates were: the weather-vanes indicating the accruing national crisis in conflicting ideals of Freedom and Centralized versus Decentralized Government. While Dr. Strong was travelling in Europe in 1859, Charles Darwin published his "Origin of Species" and in that same year John Brown made his raid at Harper's Ferry.

The nineteenth century has been called "The Century of Hope", and not without reason. Scientific achievement, industrial development, international commerce, political enfranchisements, multiplication and expansion of religious institutions and missionary activities united to justify the cognomen of "Hope" for the nineteenth century. But her portrait was painted in Watts' famous picture where "Hope as civilization sits truly enough a-top o' the world, but, alas! is blind-folded with only one chord left to cheer her heart. Canon Lacey has rightly exclaimed that the "Century of Hope" "closed with a catastrophe". The Recessional of Kipling in 1897 on the occasion of Queen Victoria's Jubilee was pertinent to the reflection of sober minds the world over when he wrote:

"If drunk with sight of power, we lose  
Wild tongues that have not thee in awe,  
Such boasting as the Gentiles use  
Or lesser breeds without the law:  
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,  
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

“For heathen heart that puts her trust  
In reeking tube and iron shard;  
All valiant dust that builds on dust,  
And guarding calls not Thee to guard;  
For frantic boast and foolish word,  
Thy mercy on thy people, Lord!

How profoundly the heart of the English people responded with gratitude to Kipling for this ringing expression, at once of their unutterable fear and their unexpressed prayer. The nineteenth century like Rossini's “Proserpina” has tasted the alluring pomegranate of material satisfactions only to meet with disillusionment. For beneath all the hope and promise, all the progress and achievement of the nineteenth century, the spirit of Nescience was rampant throughout Europe and everywhere the Christian religion was challenged with obstinate negations.

Merz, in his “History of European Thought” in the nineteenth century has summarized the deposit of the philosophies of Europe in that period. Allow me the liberty to summarize his summary. Germany had developed the tree of absolute idealism and it bore the fruit of pessimism. France cultivated the tree of positivism and it bore the fruit of scepticism. England watered the tree of naturalistic evolution and watched it with an almost superstitious trust in progress and it bore the fruit of agnosticism. Four years before he became president at Rochester, while yet only 31 years of age, the intellectual, moral and religious issues involved in the prevailing philosophies of his time had become evident to him. This fact is apparent in his two essays “Science and Religion” delivered as the commencement address of the Medical College in Cleveland, February 18, 1867, and his essay on “Philosophy and Religion”, given before the alumni of the Rochester Theological Seminary, May 28, 1868. A reading of these essays and the following four essays in his “Philosophy



and Religion" shows how clear was Dr. Strong's perspective of his own time and the crucial philosophical and theological issues involved in it.

#### SECOND PREREQUISITE.

An understanding of Dr. Strong's intellectual attitude towards his scientific, philosophical and religious environment is essential to an appreciative understanding of his "Systematic Theology".

It is not only pertinent, it is necessary to notice and to emphasize the fact that religion in such a world, in such moods and morals, must resort to the examination and use of its philosophical instruments. But it will not use what it has not tested, and what it does not trust. Dr. Strong, throughout his life as a teacher, regarded theology as a vital as well as a formal necessity of religion and theology as science, i. e., a systematic statement of religion could rest only on a basis of philosophy. "Philosophy is the Science of Foundation" said he. "It busies itself with the examination of the grounds of faith. It seeks to determine whether religion has a safe basis and support in the facts of consciousness." Its service is "that of defining and correlating the great primary conceptions of Revelation". (Philosophy and Religion, p. 3.) He held that religion "both as a system and a life" is indebted to philosophy (idem, p. 5), and with Sir William Hamilton "that there is no difficulty emerging in theology which has not first emerged in philosophy." Dr. Strong used to say: "Give me a student in metaphysics and I care not who has him in theology". "Let us have done once for all" he said, "with the notion that metaphysical studies are beside the proper work of the preacher, and by necessity mystify his brain and destroy his practical power. The history of the Church has shown that philosophy, instead of weakening the grasp and corrupting the principles of her preachers has been their great discipline and strength. No man can clearly present or successfully de-

fend the truths of religion without knowing them in their principles. A teacher of Religion who sneers at metaphysics as if it were a fog-bank in which only fools would risk their lives, is simply playing into the hands of infidelity and virtually declaring all true philosophy is on the side of the enemies of religion." (idem pp. 14-15.) It is safe to assert that few, if any, modern theologians have more constantly and consistently tested their theological dogmas by philosophical principles and both again by the criterion of religious experience than has Dr. Strong, and it is not impossible for the student of Dr. Strong's theology to find its real philosophical inwardness.

I have outlined the philosophical issues that confronted Dr. Strong from the beginning to the end of his career as a student, pastor and teacher. I consider it safe to say that though Dr. Strong fully recognized the differing shades of philosophical thought he reduced them to a three fold classification. On the one hand, there was a tendency, not only in Germany but in England and America, to carry a Berkelean idealistic philosophy to a degree which denied the objective reality of the world of matter; on the other hand, there was the tendency to carry the sensational theory of Locke to the materialistic philosophy of which, for Dr. Strong, both the positivism of Comte and the agnosticism of Spencer were the legitimate offspring. Dr. Strong early in his career perceived the crucial issue for religion which held to a conception of God having objectivity and personality, a conception of mind not mergable in matter and of master not merged in mind. If the rational beliefs in the existence of God and the soul as individual were not for him to be destroyed, either in an impersonal idealism or an absolute materialism, he must make his account with philosophy. He saw clearly the elements of truth in both idealism and materialism and also how destructive were both when pushed to their absolute extreme for the philosophical and religious conceptions of

God, the soul and the redemption of a world of sin-conscious, guilt-weighted men. Locke had made sensations to be the true and only source of ideas. Berkeley to save the spiritual source and nature of ideas went to the extreme of denying the reality of matter. Hume went to the opposite extreme and denied the existence of the self. Dr. Strong quoting Sydney Smith says: "Bishop Berkeley destroyed the world in one volume octavo and nothing remained after his time but mind which experienced a similar fate from the hand of Hume in 1737.

The idealistic solutions which Kant, Fichte and Hegel gave to the dilemmas created by Berkeley, Locke and Hume, were as unsatisfactory to Dr. Strong as were the essentially materialistic solutions (so Dr. Strong regarded them) in the positivism of Auguste Comte, the humanism of John Stuart Mill and the agnosticism of Herbert Spencer.

Speaking of this same period we have under consideration, Dr. Jacob Gould Schurman said: "The truth that mind is rational as well as sentient is fatal to the main support of agnosticism—the easy argument drawn from the dogma that knowledge is of sensations only." "And with the disappearance of sensationalism, the agnostic wise-acres who have terrified the faint-hearted amongst us by pretentiously delimiting and circumscribing human knowledge will find themselves without a vocation. No other generation, it is safe to predict, will see the farce of nescience playing at omniscience in setting the bounds of science."

Dr. Strong early discovered the contradictions in the pessimism of an absolute idealism and the agnosticism of positivistic materialism. He refused to accept either extremes and held to a realism which sustained the conception of an objectively known deity, soul and universe. Unless God, the soul and the universe could be regarded as distinctive and objective, yet known and experienced existences, there could be no satisfying philosophy for him

and the essentials of the Christian faith were destroyed at the very roots of knowledge and experience.

How Dr. Strong escaped from such a dire alternative can best be given in his own words, and the following statement gives what I regard as the logical key to Dr. Strong's dialectic and the philosophical inwardness of Dr. Strong's Systematic Theology throughout its entire sweep.

“While any monistic theory is false, whether its leanings be toward idealism or materialism, and while it is true that both departments of human research must be included in any complete system of science, it becomes a most serious question which of these two co-ordinate realms shall furnish the interpretation for the other. After what I have said, Dr. Strong continues, (you will not be surprised to hear my second and last proposition, viz. that nature must be interpreted by our knowledge mind and not mind and its phenomena by knowledge of nature; in other words the governing conception in man must be also the governing conception in nature. Man has been well called a microcosm—a little world in himself—an image of the great world of matter and mind outside of him. It is this embracing in himself of the two that qualifies him to sit as judge of both; and his own being must be the measured segment of the arc, by which he triangulates the vast universe of being that stretches away on every side around him. The senses tell him of a physical organism subject to natural laws, but is this the whole of his nature? Ah, no! another inward sense tells him of the possession of endowments totally different in kind from those of matter. He has mind, there are in him life, knowledge, will, conscience,—and nature has none of these.” (idem “Science and Religion” p. 24.)

To see that philosophical position of Dr. Strong is the second prerequisite to an appreciative study of Dr. Strong's System of Theology.



## THE THIRD PREREQUISITE.

The third prerequisite to the study of Dr. Strong's System of theology needs but the briefest reference. It is the recognition of the religious attitude of Dr. Strong's mind as articulated in his progressive evangelical theology. In other words the theology of Dr. Strong is the religious life of Dr. Strong in its mental regalia. It is the mental furniture of the house in which his soul dwelt. Philosopher as he was, the dictum of Augustine is no less applicable to Dr. Strong: "The heart makes the theologian." Philosophy was an indispensable necessity of his theology. Theology was an inescapable necessity of his religion. Religion was his life. He believed in a personal God, objective alike to the universe and his own soul. Religion was for him conformity to an infinite living, holy, loving will, in the language of Fouille "neither determined, nor indetermined, but determining".

He taught the philosophy of Ethical Monism; the theology of an immanent transcendent Christ; a Christo-Centric doctrine for the life of the Church and of the union of the believer with Christ and he focalized it all in a Stauro-Centric gospel of the redemption of humanity. He held with Schleiermacher that religion is dependence upon God and a Christo-Centric theology of the life of the Church and the Christian as clearly as Schleiermacher without sacrificing the objective historic Christ or subordinating the religion of Jesus Christ to a subjective Church and individual subjectivism and without making Church consciousness the beginning and end—the criterion of Christian truth and experience.

No less than Ritschl he held to all the merits of the "Value-Theory" in theology without committing himself to a doctrine which gave us in Jesus merely the value of God for our religious consciousness at the expense of a doctrine of an Eternal, Risen, Regnant Lord and Christ.

All the positivism of Forsyth's doctrine of the "Cen-

trality of the Cross of Christ'' Dr. Strong held as centrally and as positively, but founded in a metaphysic never fathomed by Forsyth as far as we have discovered. Here let his own words express the quintessence of his philosophy, theology and personal faith. "In the Cross of Christ" said he, "we see God's whole revelation to men summed up, and thrust upon us for our reception or rejection. In that Cross are condensed and expressed his character of holiness and of love, His judgment upon sin and His provision for the salvation of the sinner, His suffering in and with His creatures and His sacrificial offering in their behalf. Christ's Cross reveals not only the greatness of our sin and the greatness of God's love, but it opens to us the whole meaning of human history, the whole secret of the universe, the whole purpose of God when He laid the floor of the firmament without its mosaic of constellations, and bade the curtain of night and chaos to rise at the Creation." Concluding he says: "Well may the Apostle Paul say "God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

To such a conclusion as this I believe the present day student of theology will inevitably arrive, secure in his philosophy, rational in his theology and consistent in experience with the evangelical faith of our Fathers.

# BOOK REVIEWS

---

## I. CHURCH HISTORY.

**The Fundamentals of Christianity: A Study of the Teaching of Jesus and Paul.** By Henry C. Vedder, D. D. The Macmillan Company, New York. 250 pp. \$2.00 net.

The name of Professor Vedder has long been deservedly held in honor among American Baptists, notably for his work in bringing out long hidden facts about Hubmaier and other Continental Baptist pioneers, and also for his helpful presentations of later Baptist history. In this volume he enters a new field, and while his name will doubtless bring much attention to his book, it should yet be carefully weighed, all the more because while he is an authority in Church History, in Biblical and Systematic Theology, he is not an authority.

The thoughtful reader will find much in the book for which he may thank the author. In particular, a contribution which few are so qualified to make as is Professor Vedder, we have admirable discussions of the style (using the word in its broadest sense) of both Jesus and Paul and its relation to their early lives. So also there is much to protest against evils in the thought and life of the church today, protest which ministers and churches need to hear and ought to be glad to heed, from whatever source it may come. Yet it may be expected that dissent from the main propositions of the book will so alienate the majority that the protest will fall on deaf ears. It must also be recognized that the tone of the protest is too often that religiously all is

“out of joint, O cursed spite

That ever I was born to set it right.”

In general, however, the style has the clarity and force which we expect from the author. Yet in a few cases words are used which are so rare or are used in senses so rare as to constitute a real blemish. The book is also marred by too many typo-

graphical errors (such errors seem more common than some years ago, even in publications of the best houses), and the figures on the page of "Contents" are wholly wrong.

There are statements in the book which are more than questionable and should serve to put the thoughtful reader on his guard. For example, that the irony of Jesus never became "sarcasm, keen, biting, lethal" (p. 49) has been asserted by practically all critics: that Paul should be classed with the Gnostics merely because of his use of the word "aeon" (159) is inexplicable, since he employed the word in the sense of an era, they of an emanation from the divine; that the ancient Greek cities be cited as democratic, "where there was little surplus of leisure or wealth to cultivate the fine art of living," is a surprise when we remember that their social life was founded on slavery; to define democracy as "the rule of right" is fallaciously to substitute the ideal, too seldom attained, for the method by which it is sought. There are also many many instances of the careless or illegitimate use of Scripture, of which only the following examples can be now given. John 7:15 is made to teach that Jesus was "practically illiterate," if, indeed, he even knew his letters; Paul is made to tell the Athenians that they were "too religious" (56); the words of James, "guilty of all," are attributed to Paul (155); Paul is criticised (165) for saying, "Where there is no law, there is no transgression," though how is transgression possible where there is no law to transgress? and in the same connection John is said to define sin as transgression of law, though the Canterbury Revision long ago told us that he defined it as "lawlessness;" and the whole discussion of propitiation rests on the discredited interpretation of *ἱλαστήριον* (Rom. 3:25) as "Mercy-seat," this sense being made to control the meaning of *ἱλάσκεσθαι* (Heb. 2:17) and *ἱλασμος* (1 Jn. 2:2), so that the sense of expiation is wholly eliminated. Lack of space forbids giving more examples.

But all these points are unimportant compared with the main contentions of the author for which the book exists. The publishers say: "The main object of this book to convince its readers that the parting of the ways has been reached with the His-



torical Christianity based on Paul as its authority which still has such wide vogue, and that the future belongs to a Christianity that will determine its doctrines, program and methods on the authority of Jesus alone." To gain this end it is charged that the gospel of Jesus never has been accepted by the Church, and it is attempted to show that Paul's teaching as to God, sin, the significance of the death of Jesus, the salvation to be secured through Christ, all this and much else is divergent from the ideas of Christ himself to the point of antagonism. We read "It need not surprise us, still less dismay, if we find from the letters of Paul that he was loyal, not to the Jesus of fact, the real Jesus disclosed to us in the Gospels, but to an ideal Jesus whom he had created out of the Messianic hopes of his race, the sacrificial system of Judaism and the philosophical ideas that were 'in the air' in his day" (155, 6), and "It is these Judaeo-pagan notions in Paul's writings that for ages, with unconscious irony, men have been proclaiming as the real gospel of Jesus, the only pure and undefiled 'Christianity'" (159).

The other Apostles are represented as being as much in fault as Paul, more so, in fact. "His own work finished, Jesus sends forth his disciples to proclaim this prophetic religion, as the most precious truth he has to leave with them, the one truth that the world needs to learn. And what do these disciples? They instantly, with one accord, abandon prophetic religion and devote themselves to establishing a new cult—excusing themselves, no doubt, on the plea that they were making Jesus the center of that cult. They failed to see that at the very time they were deifying Jesus they were defying him." They began the greatest apostacy in history" (52). All this in spite of his promise which our author accepts and emphasizes, saying, "he assured the Twelve that he would send in his stead the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, to teach them in all things and guide them into all truth" (147).

That Paul was specially called to his Apostolic work and office is asserted, but any possibility that he received his views of truth directly from Christ is set aside. After several pages of what may not unfairly be characterized as "special pleading,"

we read, "is it not virtually the only sane opinion, that Paul received this account (of the Last Supper) from his Lord immediately, through some disciple who was present, or through current tradition? Such, then, must be regarded as the true content of the apostle's idea of 'revelation' " (147). This in the face of Paul's positive assertion as to the source of his gospel in Gal 1:11.

In particular, Paul's doctrine of the atonement is assailed and condemned. We read: "Paul's idea of law, of penalty, of expiation, offends the modern sense of justice and contradicts our ethical values at every point of contact. Without caricature, it may be compared to ideas that prevail in certain police circles today. A sensational crime is committed; the public is greatly roused and demands detection and punishment of the criminal. This the police are unable to accomplish, but obviously something must be done to silence public clamor; so they 'frame up' a case against some one who can most plausibly be made the scapegoat. He is convicted by perjury, the cry is silenced, the majesty of the law has been vindicated, justice is satisfied!" Comment is surely needless on this caricature, which, of course, remains caricature no less though marked "without caricature."

Unfortunately this is not the only case in which we find gross failure fairly to state a doctrine to which the author is opposed, but the space of this review will not permit the statement, much less the consideration, of many other points on which most of his readers will differ and by the mere statement of which many will be profoundly saddened.

DAVID FOSTER ESTES.

**Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity.** By Kirsopp Lake. Macmillan & Co. 113 pp. \$1.25.

This delightful and, in many respects, stimulating volume is made up of what was originally a series of lectures. This will, in some measure, account for so much of the "first person" element as well as for the rather patronizing attitude taken by the author to those who do not know enough to agree with him. The book

is not a history. It is rather a series of opinions about history; some of which are excellent, some otherwise, but all interesting. It is a fine book for the student of history as an example of destructive criticism. The author speaks with the finality of the historian on many subjects which are by no means settled. The author boldly states that Christianity became nothing more than "a Graeco-Oriental cult, offering salvation, just as did the other mystery religions." He sees in Christianity nothing but a "synthesis" of the multitudinous religions into which it came. All of the early disciples were rather poor, deluded fellows who disagreed among themselves. Galilee, Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth, Rome and Ephesus are his chapter heads. Each of these cities, he says, is associated with distinctive contributions to Christianity, which, according to the discussion, has nothing distinctive in itself. The author has done some excellent work in describing other religions. The main objection is in the failure to describe Christianity, concerning which he seems to know little.

F. M. POWELL.

## II. RELIGION AND MISSIONS.

**China Awakened.** By Min Ch'ien T. Z. Tyan, LL. D. (London), author of "London Through Chinese Eyes," "China's New Constitution and International Problems," and "The Legal Obligations Arising Out of Treaty Relations Between China and Other States": with special honorific endorsement by His Excellency Hsu Shih Ch'ang, President of the Chinese Republic, as well as introductions by Right Honorable Sir John Newell Jordan, K. C. B., etc., etc., and the Honorable Charles R. Crane, United States Minister to China. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1922. xvii+475 pp. \$5.00 net.

Besides the dignity of the several introductions noted in the title description, Dr. Tyan is commended by his having served as Technical Adviser to the Chinese Delegation to the Assembly of the League of Nations; by his service as Lecturer on International Law in Tsing Hua College, Peking, and by his founding and editing for some two years "The Peking Leader."

What is especially noteworthy is that a distinguished and able Chinese scholar has found it worth while to undertake to interpret his people, country and nation to English readers the world over.

For well nigh a century Westerners have been telling Westerners what China is and is not, what it is like and likely to become.

Now a man with culture and training, with extensive experience with the West comes to speak to us out of the Chinese consciousness and heart. It is worthy of note that China, so long utterly indifferent to the impression the rest of mankind might have of her, comes now to seek to shape that impression.

It is a wide range Dr. Tyan seeks to cover; education, social customs and ideals, economic and industrial development, China's share and stakes in the late war. And all the way through it is of progress, growth, readjustment that he speaks. It is "awakened China" that we are listening to and observing in our author's portrayals. With history, except very recent history, he has nothing to do.

He explicitly omits politics and finance from his survey. In truth these are two items of first interest to very many Westerners which is one good reason why a good Chinese omits them for a book which he has written for foreigners to read.

There was less reason for the rather limited attention to religion in the modern awakening. There is no separate chapter for this subject but it is treated with fairness and some real insight as part of the "Intellectual Rebirth" and in other sections as well. Christians cannot complain of any relative lack of appreciation. Elaborate appendices give the history of Japan's famous Twenty-one Demands; China's efforts at Paris to get righteous recognition, etc.

The whole work is evidently motivated largely by the author's wish to propound earnestly the question of his final chapter: "Conclusion—Is the Republic Worth Helping?" What a question to be urged upon the world by so worthy a representative of this great people! May the Washington Conference prove only the beginning of an answer affirmative with all the zeal and



faithfulness of an awakened conscience in all the world's great peoples. No serious student of China will omit this book.

W. O. CARVER.

**Bergson and Personal Realism.** By Ralph Tyler Flewelling, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Southern California. The Abingdon Press, New York and Cincinnati, 1920. 304 pp. \$2.00 net.

The "Philosophy of Change" may well be recognized as holding the center of the philosophising stage in this day whereon few actors of any worth are performing and now is a star. For a while Bergson gave promise of a good run and permanent glory. Although we hear somewhat less of him just now, he has hardly been supplanted. For the time being a jazz-crazed age seems rather to run after H. G. Wells as if he were anything in the way of a philosopher.

But quietly working away are some thinkers making little noise. Mayhap some worthy work will emerge.

Prof. Flewelling has with a brevity, a clarity and a courtesy that leave little to ask for shown the weaknesses of idea and method in the system of Bergson, a teacher to whom he pays marked deference.

I am not prepared fully to follow his distinction between intuition as acting personality and reason as reflecting personality, especially when he tends to identify intuition with habit of behavior established into unconscious action and now to be termed "life itself" (pp. 104-107). Nor am I at all prepared to assent to the notion that "the idea of a growing God, instead of king repugnant to the religious sense, might become the greatest aid to faith and theism" (p. 172). It must be said, however, that the content of this statement shows that it is to be taken only relatively and is used in a way tentatively to rationalize the Incarnation.

It is as a convincing searcher-out of the fundamental errors in Bergson and in the clear emphasis on personalism that the work excels; and for these I would heartily commend it as I receive it gratefully.

W. O. CARVER.

**Kanamori's Life-Story Told by Himself. How the Higher Criticism Wrecked a Japanese Christian—and How he Came Back.** Introduction by J. Ross Stevenson, D. D., LL. D. The Sunday School Times Company, Philadelphia, 1921. 112 pp. \$1.25.

Paul Kanamori is one of the most interesting personal products of modern Christian effort in Japan. A man of fine scholarship, a fervid and popular orator, a passionate evangelist, he is in his old age giving himself to a remarkable campaign of evangelism in his home land. A member of the first graduating class of Doshisha, he had also been a leader in the founding of the famous Kumamoto Band of student volunteers. After a period of missionary service he returned to his Alma Mater as a professor in theology. Then later came his interest in the Higher Criticism and his defection from the faith, the long years of apostacy. Then he tells how God called him back in Christ. It is all a thrilling story told in the utmost simplicity of a most humble Christian man. He took the name Paul when as a lad in the school of Capt. Janes he was led to admire the great Apostle. It is easy to see that certain phases of Paul's character and service constitute the ideal of this man of God.

It is a good book to read for many reasons.

W. O. CARVER.

**Missionary Stories for Little Folks.** By Mary T. Applegarth. First Series, Primary, 406 pp; Second Series, Junior, 406 pp. George H. Doran Company, New York, 1917. Each volume \$1.75 net.

Good stories on any subject given to the children at the right age will be determinative of their life interests. These are good missionary stories and they are admirably told here. There are fifty-two in each series, one for each Sunday in the year. There are drawings and verses of poetry with them. They are printed on splendid paper and make up highly attractive volumes.

It would not be hard to show slight defects here and there in fact and form, but nothing that is at all serious has been noted. The author is master of a very important art, and has the spirit

of a true missionary. Her stories can be commended to all teachers of these grades in Sunday schools, to all mothers and to those who give books to children for their own reading, for one knows of children who would ask nothing better than to have the privilege of reading these delightfully told stories themselves and to other children. The Junior Series is in the second edition, and it is to hope that both will run into many thousands.

W. O. CARVER.

**Preaching in London.** By Rev. Joseph Fort Newton, Litt. D., D. D., Minister of the Church of the Divine Paternity, New York. Geo. H. Doran Co., New York, 1922. 140 pp. \$1.50 net.

This most interesting volume is largely a diary kept during 1916 to 1919 while pastor of the City Temple, London. Dr. Newton has a charming style, is keenly alive to all the problems of these trying years and is sensitive to the historical environment in which he was placed. The result is a book of singular charm as he pictures men and movements as he came in touch with them. Dr. Newton was for two years a student of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary from Texas. He is not a strict denominationalist but he is a man of undoubted power. He speaks straight for a better understanding between America and England.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**Missionary Messages.** By Rev. James F. Love, D. D. George H. Doran Co. 147 pp. \$1.50.

The author of this volume of missionary addresses has for many years been corresponding secretary of one of the largest Foreign Mission Boards in America. While necessarily touching on the problems and purposes of his own denomination, Doctor Love has much to say that will be of deep significance to all who are seeking a quickened interest in Foreign Missions.

The author says in his preface, "In the main, these addresses have to do with Foreign Missions as a common Christian enter-

prise. Thoughtful men will agree that the only certain course to better understanding, mutual respect and concord among the Christian forces which are engaged in this commanding world enterprise of Foreign Missions is for each group to state with proper Christian decorum those views and principles which it holds and would have obtain in the conduct of the work, and thus allow others to examine these on their merit. Respect of one Christian denomination for another will thus be promoted and Christian unity will be the more certainly realized."

The author of these messages is the executive officer of a great foreign mission board (The Southern Baptist) whose manifold work extends into five continents and nearly a score of nations. Such a task would seem big enough to test the strength—physical, mental and spiritual—of any man.

But this mission secretary has added to these labors a list of books on devotional, denominational and missionary lines, the last of which is the present volume, "Missionary Messages."

How did Dr. Love qualify for these great labors? A friend tells us: "Through the discipline of a God-fearing father and mother; enough open air and solid work in youth to grow a strong body, and through a long and varied experience in the industry, in which the worker has been sustained by interest in his work, and a passion for those who are destitute of and lost without the Gospel."

**Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.** Vol. XII, 875 pages. Edited by James Hastings. Scribners.

This is the final volume (except an index volume) of this great work, which, from the start has been the standard encyclopaedia in its line. This final volume is well up to the high plane of the former volumes and is a fitting close to a monumental and scholarly undertaking. The list of contributors is not only large, but the contributors themselves are renowned scholars and writers. With the complete set, now available, no student, preacher or scholar can afford to be without the help and inspiration



which is thus given. This volume treats numerous subjects from "Suffering" to "Livingli." Students everywhere, who already have the other volumes, will welcome the completion of this one.

F. M. POWELL.

**Near Eastern Affairs and Conditions.** By the Hon. Stephen Panaretoff, Bulgaria. Macmillan & Company. \$2.25.

The author has for ten years filled the post of Bulgarian Minister to the United States. In these lectures he treats comprehensively of the affairs in the East, but with special reference to the Balkan situation. Naturally, the author is in position to know whereof he speaks. He makes a strong plea for a Balkan Confederation. He also gives a very interesting account of the conditions that have operated to prevent this desirable form of co-operation. The Near East question is one of interest to all thinking Americans. This book is a valuable addition to the literature on that subject. Whether one agrees with the author or not he can not but be impressed with his breadth of view and his earnest interest in this remarkable and harassed people.

F. M. POWELL.

**Making the World Christian.** By Dr. Jno. Monroe Moore, Bishop of M. E. Church, South. Geo. H. Doran Co. 323 pp. \$1.75.

The purpose of this sparkling volume is to set forth clearly the "essential objectives in missionary endeavor." Dr. Moore has had the wide experience at home and in foreign fields to write just such a book. His breadth of training as well as his complete sympathy with the great missionary enterprise fit him uniquely for the task he has done so well. The six chapters which make the book were originally six lectures given as the "Fondern Lectures" of the Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas. They thus have the ring of the speaker as well as the true marks of the scholar. Few writers, if any, have defined

the issues so distinctly as has Bishop Moore. The opening chapter, "Interpreting Religious Beliefs," is worth many times the price of the book. He makes clear that it is not a question of Christianity or some other religion, but "will the world have Christianity?" The saneness and sympathy in the chapter on "Reconstructing Man's Thinking" are very marked. What a blessing and inspiration it would be if every missionary going to the foreign field could read and study the lecture on "Creating Human-mindedness," "Elevating Social Values" and "Vitalizing Ethical Ideals." The closing chapter on "Constructing an Adequate Faith" is a fitting climax to an inspiring, instructing and incomparable volume. May Dr. Moore give us other books of like insight and devoutness.

F. M. POWELL.

### III. CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY.

**Property—Its Duties and Rights.** By various writers, with an Introduction by the Bishop of Oxford. New edition with an added essay. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1922.

It was my pleasure to write a review of the first edition of this book, and in the intervening years I have used it in my classes. My opinion has not changed that it is the best book on the subject—certainly the best with which I am acquainted. The titles of the chapters give one an idea of the scope of these discussions—"The Historical Evolution of Property, in Fact and in Idea"; "The Philosophical Theory of Property"; "The Principle of Private Property"; "The Biblical and Early Christian Idea of Property"; "The Theory of Property in Mediaeval Theology"; "The Influence of the Reformation on Ideas Concerning Wealth and Property"; "Property and Personality"; "Some Aspects of the Law of Property in England."

These chapters are written by specially equipped men. The discussions are necessarily brief, but very compact, illuminating and suggestive. Together they constitute a survey of the his-

tory and principles of the institution of property which is of very great value. The addition of the last chapter is the only change from the first edition. It is of interest, of course, to English readers, and American readers will find in it information and suggestions of value. The book ought to be read by every intelligent person; for no volume of its size will, in my judgment, prove so helpful in consideration of the most acute social and ethical problems of the present time. C. S. GARDNER.

**The Simple Gospel.** By Rev. H. S. Brewster. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1922.

One would judge from the title that this volume was written in protest against the so-called "social gospel." But that is not correct. It is a discussion of the Sermon on the Mount, and deals mainly with the social application of the Gospel. Certainly it is a well written, fresh and suggestive discussion and application of the principles of this great discourse. Of course one will take exception to the implication that "the simple gospel" is exhausted in the Sermon on the Mount. In that sermon there is certainly found the most succinct as well as the most comprehensive statement of the ethics of the "simple gospel"; but, of course, the Gospel of Jesus is more than an ethic. Aside from this stricture this book deserves commendation for its freshness, its practicalness, its conservatism, its strong grasp and its effective presentation of the ethical principles taught by Jesus.

C. S. GARDNER.

#### IV. EVANGELISM AND SERMONS.

**Constructive Evangelism.** By Ingram E. Bill. The Judson Press, Philadelphia. \$1.00 net.

The aim of the writer is a very practical and important one, namely, to press education and social service in their relations to evangelism. It is true that we are inclined to a shallow and

emotional evangelism, that ends with a simple profession of faith; and we fail to teach and lead the converts into efficient and practical lines of Christian service. The reviewer, however, does not think that the book lays sufficient emphasis upon the work of the Holy Spirit, and the vital necessity of repentance, faith and regeneration. But of course the author limits his emphasis to the above practical aims. There is also a timely discussion of methods, and a strong appeal to service. One especially helpful chapter is upon "The Children's Story Hour," and another timely study is upon "The Musical Service." There is much of practical value and stimulus in this thoughtful and up-to-date little volume, and no pastor or soul winner can read it thoughtfully without great profit.

P. T. HALE.

**A Guide to Preachers.** By A. E. Garvie, M. A., D. D. George H. Doran Company, New York. 339 pp. \$1.50 net.

Every reader of the author's "Christian Preacher" will wish to place this practical handbook on the preacher's duties beside it on the shelf of his everyday working library.

The great teacher and preacher has gathered into this volume the ripened fruit of long years of rich experience. Under four heads: How to Study the Bible, How to State the Gospel, How to Preach, How to Meet the Age, he lays out treasures old and new from his storehouse of wisdom. The late Marcus Dods said, "In our judgment the book is of quite incalculable value."

**The Story of the American Hymn.** By Edward S. Linde. Abingdon Press.

The title "History" attached to any book would more or less condemn it in the minds of ordinary mortals; remove the first two letters of the word and every one will listen to a well told "story." The charm of this book is that it has a history to tell but holds one's attention like a story. From the Bay Psalm



Book to the Gospel Hymn is a long jump; equally as far apart are the tuning fork and the pipe organ. The intervening distance is filled with struggles which from our vantage point may seem ridiculous, yet to some our forefathers an innovation such as a man-made hymn in the church service could be born only of the Devil. The introduction of instrumental music into the services served to draw the line of battle between the age-old forces of Radicalism and Conservatism. In fact the story of the development of American hymnology is one in which the progressives have won almost completely. The author of this book deals capably with the details down to the "modern hymn" as the conservative calls the present day tendencies in song writing for the church. The book is valuable to anyone interested in the growth of the American people or in the praise service of the American people or in the praise service of the church.

**Sermons for Special Days.** By Rev. F. D. Kershner, M. A., LL. D. George H. Doran Co. 223 pp. \$1.50.

Dr. Kershner has made a distinct place for himself among Christian scholars in America. Not only within the great circle of Disciples wherein he has ministered so acceptably as preacher, college president, editor and professor, but among the leaders of the church at large he has won admiration and a sympathetic hearing.

These twenty-one sermons for occasions embody that sanity, that eminently Christian spirit, that logical clearness and literary finish which are characteristic of Dr. Kershner's discourses.

The busy preacher will find here a sermon or several sermons for every special occasion of the year.

**The Victory of God.** By Rev. James Reid, M. A. George H. Doran Co., New York. 308 pp. \$2.00.

"The Minister of St. Andrew's Church, Eastbourne, has won no ordinary reputation as a powerful preacher. In this volume

of noble sermons he will assuredly reach a very wide audience, with a voice which speaks in clear, ringing accents concerning the great certainties of faith. In Mr. Reid's pages we catch the living tones of a preacher who is pleading with man so earnestly that his language grows simple, forcible, direct. We have not found one obscure sentence in the volume. Quotations and illustrations all bear the fine, inevitable touch: they belong where they occur. There is a beautiful absence of rhetoric. As you read, you can imagine that you are listening to the speaker's very accents; and you find yourself envying his regular congregation."—*British Weekly*.

The author of this volume of 25 sermons inspires the *Baptist Times* (London) to say, 'The reputation which Mr. Reid has gained is not surpassed today by any other preacher in this country.'

**Parables for Little People.** By J. W. G. Ward. George H. Doran Co. \$1.50.

Fifty-two (one for each Sunday in the year) original sermonets by one who has distinguished himself by his ministry to children. Mr. Ward has gathered and held a large junior congregation with these quaint and beautiful little discourses. They have formed one of the striking features of his work at the famous old London church. Their originality and charm aroused a widely expressed desire that they be published in book form so as to become available for use by teachers, parents and preachers everywhere. *This fine book was published last Fall but in some unaccountable way was not sent out for review. We believe you will find it deserving of special consideration.*

Rev. J. W. G. Ward is successor to Rev. Dr. G. Campbell Morgan at New Court Church, Tollington Park, London. The *British Weekly* for March 23rd says: "The remarkable success that has followed the ministry of Rev. J. W. G. Ward at New Court Tollington, continues, and it is almost the usual thing now to see the spacious edifice crowded to the doors every Sun-

day evening. Mr. Ward is preaching again for Dr. Jowett next Sunday, but in the summer he returns to America and Canada."

At the invitation of Dr. Kelman he fills the famous pulpit at Fifth Avenue and takes part in the conference at Northfield at the request of Mr. Moody. Mr. Ward's last book has just been published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, and it is already meeting with a big demand in America.

**Creative Christianity: A Collection of Addresses Delivered at Westminster Chapel Under the Auspices of the World's Evangelical Alliance.** A re-affirmation of some of the fundamental truths of Christianity. George H. Doran Co. \$2.00.

These significant addresses by some of the greatest evangelical readers of Christian thought in England today treat such vital and timely themes as "Science and the Bible," "Scepticism and Morality," "Liberalism and Theology," "Christ and the Bible," "The Coming of Christ" and others as important. It is hoped that the publication of these addresses will fulfill over a wider area the purpose of their original delivery. Their aim is to give leading in a time of much confusion of theological thought when Evangelical doctrines and interpretations essential to the faithful presentation of the Gospel of Christ are being called in question.

The list of distinguished contributors with titles of their addresses are as follows: H. Wace, D. D., Dean of Canterbury, "Science and the Bible"; D. M. Panton, B. A., "Modern Thought and the Fall"; Rev. F. B. Meyer, "The Holy Spirit in Relation to 'Fundamental Truths'"; The Rev. Prebendary A. W. Gouch, M. A., "Scepticism and Morality"; Rev. R. C. Gillie, M. A., "Liberalism and Theology"; Rev. H. Tydeman Chilvers, "The Power to Transform the Individual"; Rev. Dr. J. D. Jones, "The Power to Transform Society"; Rev. Canon H. W. Wilson, R. D., Rector of Cheltenham, "The Recovery of the Church"; Rev. W. Fuller Gooch, "The Holy Spirit in Relation to 'Creative Christianity'"; Rev. Dinsdale T. Young, "The

Crucified Christ"; Dr. John Douglas Adam, "The Risen Christ"; Canon J. S. Simpson, D. D., "Christ and the Bible"; Rev. M. E. Aubrey, M. A., "The World's Need"; Rev. Canon T. Guy Rogers, M. C., B. D., "The Church's Response," and Rev. Dinsdale T. Young, "The Coming of Christ."

**Sermons for the Great Days of the Year.** By Rev. Russell H. Conwell, D. D. George H. Doran Co., New York. \$1.50.

One of the most notable ministries in the history of the American pulpit is that of Dr. Conwell at the Temple in Philadelphia. It was there on the memorial days of the year that the sermons in this volume were delivered. From New Year's and St. Valentine's Day, through Lincoln's and Washington's birthdays, Palm Sunday, Easter, Mother's Day, Decoration Day, Children's Day, Graduation Day, Patriotic Day, Harvest Home and Rally Day to Thanksgiving and Christmas, these messages from a master of pulpit technique, travel the round of the year's celebrations.

Rev. Russell H. Conwell, D. D., is minister at the Temple, Philadelphia, and president of Temple University, Philadelphia. His record as lecturer, author, and philanthropist is known to all. He was a soldier in the Union Army during the Civil War, rising to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. After the war he practiced law for a few years. For a time he was foreign correspondent on the staff of the New York Tribune. In 1879 he was ordained to the Baptist ministry. He is one of America's great men.

**Modernism in Religion.** By J. Machids Sterrett. The Macmillan Company. 186 pp. \$1.50.

This book is really different. It is thrilling, it is scholarly, it is devout. The author is well fitted by training and by profession (preacher-teacher) to write such a book. There is a conspicuous absence of both the "cant" of the ecclesiastic and the



"can't" of the skeptic. The charm of the book is greatly enhanced by the "personal confession" element which runs throughout. The author is an Episcopalian. We would never know it if he didnt tell it. In fact, his beliefs and expressions are such that one wishes to forgive him for that grave fault. He is a modern, not in the highbrow and agnostic sense, but in the sense in which he describes one: "A Christian modernist is one who is a thankful heir of all the Christian ages, but feels that he should not be the slave of any of them." One does not have to agree with a great writer to be helped by him. This book is thoroughly helpful in that it forms a delightful and healthful middle ground between the dogmatic reactionary and the dogmatic radical. The author belongs to the "higher critic" class, but of that class whose criticism is higher. He is sympathetic throughout and this book will doubtless prove a blessing to many who are outside the church. There is a consecrated common sense which graces every page. The book should be read with a given amount of caution, for some statements, perfectly natural for the author, will require restatement. There are thirteen short, meaty chapters in the book, but Chapters II, III, IV, VI and VII, under the headings "Modernism," "Polity," "Doctrine," "What is God Like" and "Modern Biblical Criticism," respectively, are worthy of special study. The chapter on "What is God Like" is worth several times the price of the book. The reading of such a book, regardless of what one thinks, will make one think. Unlike many writers who believe practically with the author, this book will clear rather than create doubts. This book should grace many libraries. It is stimulative, and to most types of minds, wholesome. One knows of no book in which constructive "destruction" is so delightfully manifest.

F. M. POWELL.

**Evangelistic Sermons.** By J. Wilbur Chapman. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. 219 pp. \$1.50.

This book is welcomed by the many admirers of Dr. Chapman. It contains his best revival addresses. The volume con-

tains eighteen of his most inspiring addresses. One can almost hear the great Chapman's persuasive voice from the printed page. These sermons are truly valuable to all lovers of the Lord.

H. C. WAYMAN.

## V. NEW TESTAMENT.

**Some New Source Material on the Book of Acts.** The Macmillan Company.

In the *American Journal of Philology* for 1896, Dr. F. C. Conybeare drew attention to an Armenian catena which seemed to point to the existence of an early Syriac text of the Acts different from the Peshitto. Many extracts from this article were also used by Dr. Rendel Harris in his "Four Lectures on the Western Text," and he and Dr. Conybeare between them showed that the Syriac text underlying the catena probably belonged to the same textual type as the Curetonian and Sinaitic manuscripts of the Gospels. Dr. Conybeare always believed that there existed in Armenian the full text of Ephrem's commentary which was used in the catena, and while he was at the Harvard Divinity School in 1919 he was able to trace a manuscript of this commentary in the catalogue of the Library of the Mechitarists at Vienna. The Armenian text has now been published by the Mechitarist Father Akinian as the first part of the second volume of the critical edition of the *Literature and Translations of the ancient Armenians*. It proves to be a very pure form of the Western text of Acts, cognate to the margin of the Hareclean Syriac, but there are unfortunately considerable lacunae in it.

It was obviously desirable that this very important document should be rendered accessible to scholars who are ignorant of Armenian. Dr. Conybeare has therefore translated the commentary and added to it all the relevant passages from the Ar-

menian catena, some of which enable him to fill up lacunae in the text of the commentary. His work will appear as an appendix to Volume III of "The Beginnings of Christianity," edited by Drs. Foakes Jackson and Lake, published by Messrs. Macmillan. This volume is planned to contain the text of Acts with a selected apparatus criticus and a critical commentary. It has been entrusted by the editors to Professor James Hardy Ropes and is almost ready for press.

**The Psychic Health of Jesus.** By Walter E. Bundy, Ph. D., Professor of the English Bible in De Pauw University. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1922. 299 pp. \$3.00.

For most people this is a useless book and for many a really harmful one. It is to be hoped that it is not a sample of the author's own teaching in DePauw University. The word "psychic" has come to mean for many the abnormal and to be queer. There were some who took Jesus to be insane and under the influence of the Devil. Some Dutch and German writers have taken the attitude that Jesus was a Paranoiac and find in that the explanation of His claims to deity. The whole thing to a Christian is blasphemous. Dr. Bundy (p. 266) denies that "Jesus' picture of the future" was "fanatical," but thinks it "was fantastic and fanciful." The book is itself "fantastic and fanciful," if not "fanatical." It is a collection of the views of all modern cranks about Christ and is fit only for the waste basket, where it will go.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**Types of Preachers in the New Testament.** By A. T. Robertson, M. A., D. D., LL. D., Litt. D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. George H. Doran Company, New York, 1922.

Dr. Robertson's prolific pen has given us in this volume one of his most practical and helpful contributions to the understand-

ing and appreciation of the New Testament. It is characterized by his very suggestive method of grouping facts, which of itself gives them a larger meaning. He picks his way through the familiar and beloved volume by a new route and finds along the way much fruit.

The titles of his chapters are always suggestive. Here are a few: "Apollos, the Minister With Insufficient Preparation"; "Barnabas, the Young Preacher's Friend"; "Philemon With a Social Problem"; "Silas, the Comrade"; "Titus, the Courageous"; "Matthew, the Business Man in the Ministry"; "Diotrephes, the Church Regulator." The characters are briefly treated, but the leading trait of each one is brought out clearly as a sample of a type. The preacher of today will find reading these chapters practically helpful in understanding himself and properly interpreting his brethren in the ministry, nearly every one of whom belongs to one of these types.

C. S. GARDNER.

## VI. PEDAGOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY.

**Psychology and the Christian Life.** By Rev. T. W. Pym, D. S. O., M. A., Head of Cambridge House. George H. Doran Company, New York. 175 pp. \$1.50 net.

Not since Dr. Stalker's "Christian Psychology" has there been a volume quite so valuable and practical in the application of the discoveries and teachings of the new psychology in the field of Christian faith. Professor Pym does not represent the radical, extreme psychologists. "The object of the book," he himself says, "is to provide something in the nature of a summary of psychological theory, in so far as it bears on Christian faith and ethics, for the use of those who have not the time to read deeply in psychology, yet need the help that psychology



can give." The writer's Episcopal standpoint is reflected in his theological conclusions, but this bias is not sufficient to mar the value of the discussion. The eight chapters treat on "Psychology and Common Sense," "Psychology in the World," "Faith and Suggestion," "The Psychology of Sin," "Christianity and Psycho-Analysis," "The Psychology of Jesus—His Teaching," "The Psychology of Jesus—His Practice," and "General Conclusions." The teacher and preacher who want better to understand human nature, and who are interested in soul-processes and spiritual dynamics, dealt with penetratingly and reverently, will find in this book a source of genuine help.

G. S. DOBBINS.

**The Psychology of Religion, and Its Application in Preaching and Teaching.** By James H. Snowden, D. D., LL. D. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 390 pp. \$2.00 net.

There has been need of a comprehensive text book which gathers up the latest and best in this field of expanding interest and growing importance, and applies the accepted principles of psychology to the work of the teacher and preacher of religion. Dr. Snowden is well known for his sound and reverent biblical scholarship. A safe and sane theologian, he brings to the task of applying this new science to religion discriminating common sense, wide experience, and rare judgment as to relative values.

The book is divided into eight sections. The first deals with the Psychology of the Soul, and in the light of the latest thinking discusses the intellect, sensibility, and the will. The next section deals with General Characteristics of the Soul—habit, character, individuality, the sub-conscious mind, growth. The third section treats of the Psychology of the Moral and Religious Nature. The fourth and fifth sections are perhaps the most valuable of the book, dealing as they do with the Psychology of Sin and the Psychology of Conversion. Dr. Snowden does not throw overboard the old biblical conceptions of sin and salvation,

but undertakes to show how these great doctrines are rooted in human experience and borne out by the scientific study of human nature. The *Psychology of the Christian Life* has in it some richly suggestive material for the preacher.

The last three sections of the book are homiletical and pedagogical. What does this analysis of the course of human experience and the faculties of body, mind and soul mean to the preacher and teacher? How may he actually apply the knowledge acquired in becoming more effective and skillful? What is the broader meaning of preaching and teaching? Dr. Snowden does not add much to what is widely known and generally accepted in the field of practical homiletics and pedagogy, but he shows how these fundamental principles are grounded in psychological necessity, and re-enforces what the great teachers and preachers have often said concerning the essential principles of teaching and preaching.

This is one of the books on psychology that the preacher need have no hesitation in adding to his library. It is written for the general reader as well as the student of the science, and is free from confusing technical terminology.

G. S. DOBBINS.

**How to Conduct a Church Vacation School.** By Albert H. Gage. The Judson Press, Philadelphia. 166 pp. \$1.50 net.

One of the most significant movements of recent years in the field of religious education has been that to extend the program of instruction in the Bible into the week days. Various experiments have been and are being tried, the most practical and satisfactory of which has been the Daily Vacation Bible School. From an effort on behalf of the neglected elements in the community, this type of school has come to be recognized as the opportunity of the church for a religious educational program for its entire constituency, and that the vacation school may be made a real school. Mr. Gage writes from wide personal experi-

ence and observation. Passing from a discussion of general principles underlying the need and purposes of the vacation school, he proceeds to outline practical plans for conducting the school, dealing helpfully with matters of administration, curriculum, dramatics, games, music, handwork, exhibits, etc. The closing chapter on "The Larger Outlook of the Church Vacation School" is optimistic and suggestive. Workers who are interested in the extension of the church's program of religious education will want this book.

G. S. DOBBINS.

**The Bible for School and Home: Genesis.** By Rev. J. Paterson Smyth, B. D., LL. D. George H. Doran Co., New York. 196 pp. \$1.50 net.

This is the first in a proposed series of five volumes by Dr. Smyth, prepared to be used as commentaries in the Week Day Church School, the Sunday school, and the home. Volume one deals with the book of Genesis; volume two, Moses and the Exodus; volume three, Joshua and the Judges; volume four, the Prophets and Kings; volume five, the Life of our Lord.

The writer is thoroughly modern in his viewpoint, accepting as established most of the claims of the higher critics as to the composite authorship of Genesis. He finds no difficulty in reconciling the Genesis account of Creation with the theories of the theistic evolutionists. He feels that it is much better to accept frankly the modern view and teach the Bible accordingly, than to have children who have been taught the traditional view discover later that it is at variance with the teachings of science, thus weakening their faith in the fundamental verities. He takes pains to emphasize that the writers of the books of the Bible wrote their histories of past ages "much in the way that Mr. Green or Professor Gardiner or any other historian wrote his history." Some may raise the question as to whether it would be more conducive to a vital faith to have such assertions taught the immature young people of our Sunday school than to have

them shocked by the claims of the scientists and higher critics in later life! Yet Dr. Smyth has made the great stories of Genesis to thrill with life and interest through his ability as story-teller and character-delineator. The discriminating, mature teacher will find the volume inspiring and helpful.

G. S. DOBBINS.

**Parables for Little People.** By J. W. G. Ward, successor to Dr. G. Campbell Morgan at New Court Church, Tollington Park, London. George H. Doran Company, New York. 220 pp. \$1.50 net.

The demand for original, bright, illuminating stories for young people never grows less, but rather increases as preachers and teachers recognize the importance of the story-form in reaching the hearts of children—or grown-ups, either, for that matter. It would be difficult to discover in a single volume such wealth of originality as mark these “Parables” of Dr. Ward’s. He does not “talk down” to his junior congregations, yet the stories are all simple, concrete, colorful, interesting, human. One wonders where he ran upon so many new illustrations of old truths in vivid stories. Many, no doubt, are of his own devising. There are fifty-two sermonettes (for such the stories really are), one for each Sunday in the year. Those who wish to replenish their stock of talks to children will eagerly welcome Dr. Ward’s contribution.

G. S. DOBBINS.

**Prayers of Frank W. Gunsaulus.** Collected by Helen C. Gunsaulus. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. \$1.25 net.

Perhaps there is no more difficult or important part of a public service of worship than public praying—and usually no part so unsatisfying and poorly done. Dr. Gunsaulus was noted for the richness, warmth, devoutness, comforting power and spon-



tianity of his public prayers. This volume contains many of these prayers, as offered in his own pulpit, Central Church, Chicago, reported stenographically. They are grouped under four general heads: "Prayers at Opening of Service," "Prayers During Service," "Prayers in War-Time," "Prayers for Special Occasions." Of course no one would consciously imitate another's praying. But as a model to inspire to more care and effectiveness in public prayer, and as food for one's spiritual life and private devotions, these prayers can be made exceedingly helpful.

G. S. DOBBINS.

**Flash-Lights From the Seven Seas.** By William L. Stidger. George H. Doran Co., New York. 214 pp. \$2.00 net.

Here is a mission study book that is different. Mr. Stidger, who is author of "Standing Room Only," and knows how to tell a story, made a tour of the Orient and the Far East, and reports inimitably what he saw and some of the experiences he had among the strange peoples of the earth. The writer has a rare gift of humor, which lends unusual charm to his stories. At the same time he knows human nature and the grace of God, and his revelations of need and opportunity among the non-Christian races will stir to new faith and to renewed enthusiasm for the missionary enterprise. The book is splendidly adapted for the use of an organized Sunday school class, or for any group who cannot be readily appealed to with the usual hum-drum recital of missionary facts.

G. S. DOBBINS.

**Graded Bible Stories.** By William James Mutch, Professor of Philosophy and Religion in Ripon College. In four volumes, 150 pp. each. George H. Doran Company, New York. \$1.50 net.

The phenomenally rapid extension of the Week-Day Church School idea has created the demand for adequate text-books, and

this series in four volumes has been planned to meet the need. The books are more than Bible stories re-told; they constitute a guide to teachers in the presentation of adapted Bible material to the various grades, from Beginners to Intermediates. Not only are helpful suggestions given for teaching the lessons, but home work, hand work, expressional activities, dramatics, etc., are indicated, together with talks to teachers that are of practical pedagogical value. "Both material and method conform to the recognized standards in modern education," the publishers claim in their foreword, "and this special plan of teaching is the result of long and wide experimentation." The writer carefully avoids philosophizing and theological deductions. His simple and successful purpose is to present the Bible material in such form as to be best adapted to the pupil at his various stages of development.

G. S. DOBBINS.

**The Crisis of the Churches.** By Leighton Parks. Charles Scribners' Sons. 256 pp. \$2.50.

Dr. Parks feels, as does every thinking man, that the world crisis forms a crisis in the churches. As to the nature of that crisis, readers will often, and should often differ with the author. There is much delightful reading in the book and much scholarly material. He seems to hold rather loose and patronizing views of the "church" and certainly of many of the churches' adherents. The book is really not new, it is very much in keeping with a host of rather well written useless attacks on the church, the Bible and all systems of theology differing with that of the multitudinous authors. The old question of "replacing 'the churches' by the church" is vigorously set forward. Possibly the collapse of the gigantic Inter-Church World Movement was not heard by the author. It is folly to talk of more organizations or a *new* one all-embracing. Perhaps the crisis is more with individuals than with the churches—Dr. Parks' church is one that does much speaking for its members. The crisis is perhaps

that men have sinned and are sinning and need, and must have Jesus Christ, the Jesus Christ of the Gospels.

F. M. POWELL.

**Leaders of Young People.** By Frank Wade Smith. The Methodist Book Concern, New York. 224 pp. \$1.00 net.

This manual is one of the "Worker and Work Series" of the Methodists, North, and is intended for study by leaders in young people's societies and similar groups of young people in the church. It is an advance over the manuals of methods which have been current, and undertakes rather discussion and outlines of underlying principles in young people's work in the light of modern needs and conditions. The key-note of the book is "social service," and many valuable suggestions are given by which leaders are to utilize their young people in practical service of church, community, nation, and the world. The chapters on evangelism and worship are stimulating, and needed in a program that would otherwise be abnormal in its emphasis on good works. A rather unusual chapter for such a manual is "Training for Parenthood," but the subject is handled delicately and wholesomely—and profitably for the leader of young people who knows how to deal with this difficult topic. Workers with young people will want to add this volume to their library of "tools."

C. S. DOBBINS.

## VII. MISCELLANEOUS.

**The American Home Series.** American Baptist Publishing Society. 15 and 20 cents each.

The American Home Series deals with specific problems which teachers and parents must face. Each pamphlet deals with a

single vital subject, such as "The Nation's Challenge to the Home," "Table Talk in the Home," "Sunday in the Home," "Youth's Outlook Upon Life," etc. Because the home is facing a challenge, these pamphlets will be read with profit.

H. C. WAYMAN.

**The Children's Division of the Little Sunday School.** By Maud Junken Baldwin. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. 60 cents.

A very suggestive little book of six chapters. It will be especially helpful to those who must still work in the one room church building. The plea for co-operation of parents and teachers is timely and well stated.

**The Blue Guides—London and Environs and Belgium and the Western Front—Muirhead.** Macmillan & Company, London. 10d net each.

These very valuable guides, now the fourth impression, are fast taking a leading place. The vast amount of information compressed within such small volumes is amazing. These guides are invaluable to English speaking travelers.

H. C. WAYMAN.

**The Story of Mankind.** By Hendrik Van Loon. Boni and Liveright, New York, 1922. Seventh printing. 489 pp. \$5.00 net.

Mr. Van Loon is a Dutchman who has become Americanized. He is Professor of Social Science at Antioch College. He has written for children to get them to understand the world in which they live and to love history. His own children had been taught to hate history. He has produced a wonderful book that fascinates grown people even more than children. It is the work



of a genius who has produced a masterpiece. The author deals properly with the great movements and does not carry on an anti-Christian propaganda as Wells has done. He does not undertake to appraise Christ or Christianity, but he is not hostile in tone or spirit. He accepts the evolutionary veto of the world, but not in the sense that Wells does and is far more modest and cautious in his statements with much more of literary claim. The one hundred and fifty pictures are a delight.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**Through Three Centuries.** By Jesse L. Rosenberger. University of Chicago Press. 407 pp. \$2.50.

This book is a series of connected life stories tracing through successive generations, changes as well as developments from early Puritan days to the present time. In the narrative are many references to historical events, local customs, religious history, educational growths, etc., with extensive references to original sources. No one can read the thrilling stories of these stalwart and earnest souls, as they made history by establishing settlements, founding institutions, nurturing and fostering education and Christianity, without a profound gratitude for the foundation and constructive work of the men who labored and into whose labors we have entered. The principal characters studied are Baptists and there are numerous reliable and interesting facts connected with the founding and developing of that great denomination in various parts of this country. This book is not only a very interesting story, it is valuable history. It is delightfully written, contains over 30 illustrations, has a worthwhile index and a bibliography that is quite valuable. The book deserves a wide reading.

F. M. POWELL.

# INDEX TO BOOK REVIEWS.

---

	Page
Applegarth, Mary T.: Missionary Stories for Little Folks.....	349
Baldwin, Maud Junken: The Children's Division of the Little Sunday School .....	371
Bill, Ingram E.: Constructive Evangelism .....	354
Brewster, H. S.: The Simple Gospel .....	354
Bundy, Walter E.: The Psychic Health of Jesus .....	362
Chapman, J. Wilbur: Evangelistic Sermons .....	360
Conwell, Russell H.: Sermons for the Great Days of the Year....	359
Creative Christianity .....	358
Flewelling, Ralph Tyler: Bergson and Personal Realism .....	348
Gage, Albert H.: How to Conduct a Church Vacation School.....	365
Garvie, A. E.: A Guide to Preachers .....	355
Gunsaulus, Helen C.: Prayers of Frank W. Gunsaulus.....	367
Hastings, James: Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics .....	351
Kershner, F. D.: Sermons for Special Days .....	356
Lake, Kirsopp: Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity...	345
Linde, Edward S.: The Story of the American Hymn .....	355
Love, James F.: Missionary Messages .....	350
Moore, Jno. Monroe: Making the World Christian .....	352
Mutch, William James: Graded Bible Stories.....	368
Newton, Joseph Fort: Preaching in London .....	350
Panaretoff, Stephen: Near Eastern Affairs and Conditions .....	352
Parks, Leighton: The Crisis of the Churches .....	369
Property—Its Duties and Rights .....	353
Pym, T. W.: Psychology and the Christian Life .....	363
Reid, James: The Victory of God .....	356
Robertson, A. T.: Types of Preachers in the New Testament....	362
Rosenberger, Jesse L.: Through Three Centuries .....	372
Smith, Frank Wade: Leaders of Young People .....	370
Smyth, J. Paterson: The Bible School and Home: Genesis.....	366
Snowden, James H.: The Psychology of Religion, and Its Application in Preaching and Teaching .....	364
Some New Source Material on the Book of Acts .....	361
Sterrett, J. Machids: Modernism in Religion .....	359
Stevenson, J. Ross: Kanamori's Life-Story Told by Himself. How the Higher Criticism Wrecked a Japanese Christian—and How he Came Back .....	349
Stidger, William L.: Flash-Lights from the Seven Seas .....	368
The American Home Series .....	370
The Blue Guides—London and Environs and Belgium and the Western Front—Muirhead .....	371
Tyan, Min Ch'ien T. Z.: China Awakened .....	346
Van Loon, Hendrik: The Story of Mankind .....	371
Vedder, Henry C.: The Fundamentals of Christianity: A Study of the Teaching of Jesus and Paul .....	342
Ward, J. W. G.: Parables for Little People .....	357
Ward, J. W. G.: Parables for Little People .....	367



# OUR NEWEST BOOK PUBLICATIONS

---

## EVOLUTION—A MENACE.

By J. W. PORTER, D. D., LL. D.

Price 60 Cents.

This little book is clear and concise in its analysis, challenging and commanding in its discussion and will be convincing and compelling in its conclusion.

---

## FUNDAMENTALS OF THE FAITH.

By W. D. NOWLIN, D. D., LL. D.

Price \$1.25.

Dr. Nowlin has a remarkable faculty for getting at the core of things and putting his propositions clearly and convincingly. In simple language that all can understand, he sets at rest many troublesome questions. He emphasizes the essentiality of obedience, and stands four-square by the Divine plan for the evangelization of the world contained in the Great Commission. The Baptist message is rich in Scripture, and in its very essence, evangelistic.

---

## YOUR BOY AND GIRL.

By REV. A. T. JAMISON, D. D.

Price \$1.25.

Papers on the Rearing of Children.

These chapters on the practical training of the child are the result of more than twenty years of notable service in the education of the young. The author has been Superintendent of the **Connie Maxwell Orphanage, S. C.**, for almost a generation. Therefore, he is well equipped to speak on such a subject as the title of this book.

---

Order From

**BAPTIST SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD**

Nashville, Tenn.